The Mennonite Quarterly Review

VOLUME XXVII OCTOBER 1953 NUMBER FOUR

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 258

SPIRITUALISTIC TENDENCIES AND MOVEMENTS AMONG THE DUTCH MENNONITES OF THE 16TH AND 17TH CENTURIES 259
H. W. Meihuizen, The Hague, Netherlands

THE IMPACT OF CONTEMPORARY MENNONITE EVANGELISTIC OUTREACH ON THE LARGER SOCIETY 305
John A. Hostetler, Scottdale, Pa.

ATTENDANCE IN MENNONITE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1951-52 331
Silas Hertzler, Goshen College

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND RESEARCH NOTES 341
A Guide to Maps in Mennonite Books and Periodicals
Melvin Gingerich

BOOK REVIEWS 351
Mulford Q. Sibley and Philip E. Jacob, *Conscription and Conscience: The American State and the Conscientious Objector*
Reviewed by Guy F. Hershberger

The Meaning of Love. Edited by Ashley Montagu.
Reviewed by H. Clair Amstutz

Walther Bienert, *Krieg, Kriegsdienst und Kriegsdienstverweigerung nach der Botschaft des Neuen Testaments*
Reviewed by John Howard Yoder

EDITORIAL

BEGINNING WITH ALFRED HEGLER AND ERNST TROELTSCH A CLEAR LINE OF distinction has been drawn between Spiritualists and Anabaptists in the Reformation period. The Spiritualists are understood to be primarily individualistic mystics with little concern for the church *(Gemeinde)* either as an institution or as a brotherhood, and still less for the order and discipline of a body. They emphasize the inner Word and minimize the outer Word. The Anabaptists are understood to lay major emphasis on the central place of the church as a brotherhood with order and discipline, on the plain teaching of the Scriptures and on obedience and discipleship to Christ. The school of thought represented by most of the writers of the REVIEW, together with most writers in Anabaptist history and theology of the past two generations, has held that all three original Anabaptist groups, the Swiss Brethren, the Dutch Mennonites, and the Hutterites were not Spiritualists, although some Spiritualistic tendencies appeared among them in the initial stages such as in Hans Denk.

The thorough and scholarly study in this issue of "Spiritualistic Tendencies and Movements Among the Dutch Mennonites of the 16th and 17th Centuries" by Ds. H. W. Meihuizen of The Hague, Holland, takes a somewhat different line. Meihuizen holds that "the Spiritualistic trend is clear in the history of the Dutch Mennonites, though we cannot designate the brotherhood as a whole as a spiritualistic one," that "it [Spiritualism] was present from the beginning . . . and it conquered." His careful marshalling of evidence for this thesis presents an intensely interesting and weighty argument, although it also raises certain questions of interpretation of the evidence. It is clear where the author's sympathies lie; he is glad that Spiritualism finally conquered in the Dutch brotherhood. His paper calls for a careful reconsideration of the entire case and the REVIEW hopes to publish another paper dealing critically with the general issue of Spiritualism in the Anabaptist movement.

A SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF THE "SOCIOLOGY OF MENNONITE EVANGELISM" IN THE recent period, undertaken by a young doctoral candidate in sociology for the Mennonite Board of Missions and Charities, has resulted in a valuable and enlightening report. An excerpt from this study by John A. Hostetler is presented in this issue under the title, "The Impact of Contemporary Mennonite Evangelistic Outreach on the Larger Society." An analysis of the flow of incoming and outgoing members is presented, based upon statistical evidence drawn from a large body of questionnaires. It produces revealing insights on the types of out-group converts gained and the reasons for their accession, as well as on the types of members lost and the grounds for their loss. Since the earnest and sincere purpose of the group must be to win many more out-group converts and to retain all its own members, both leaders and members can well afford to ponder this report and learn its lessons.

THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL REPORT ON ATTENDANCE IN MENNONITE SECONDARY Schools and Colleges (1951-52) by Silas Hertzler again presents its valuable attendance and graduation statistics. Apart from a slight drop in the High School attendance figures, due largely to discontinuance of one school and withdrawal of another, no significant change appears.

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

VOLUME XXVII OCTOBER 1953 NUMBER FOUR

SPIRITUALISTIC TENDENCIES AND MOVEMENTS AMONG THE DUTCH MENNONITES OF THE 16th AND 17th CENTURIES

H. W. MEIHUIZEN*

Spiritualistic[1] Christians can be characterized as having a deep experience of their personal relation to the living God. They believe that all their convictions and feelings are called forth by the working of the Holy Spirit. Therefore they were called spiritualists.[2] But if we study their lives and writings we see that they did not consider the Holy Spirit as the third person of the Holy Trinity; spiritualists do not occupy themselves greatly either about that dogma or about other dogmatic statements of theology. The Holy Spirit was only another name for God Himself. Consequently, and the fact is remarkable, they seldom mentioned the Spirit as such. Asked for what they believed about the Holy Spirit, most of them answered that He was the Power of God, but not a Personality.[3]

* Ds. H. W. Meihuizen is pastor of the Mennonite Church of The Hague, Netherlands, and one of the editors of the *Algemeen Doopsgezind Weekblad.*

1 The term spiritualistic, commonly used in the European writings, is maintained here because it is irreplaceable. It holds the value of "spiritual," as used by Rufus M. Jones in his *Spiritual Reformers,* and of "mystical," as used by the same author in his *Studies in Mystical Religion* as well.

2 Walther Köhler, *Dogmengeschichte; Zeitalter der Reformation* (Zürich, 1951) 87-91 and *passim.*

3 For instance, Hans van der Maes; *Offer des Heeren,* ed. S. Cramer in *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica* (B.R.N.) II ('sGravenhage, 1904) 361.

This power they had experienced at the moment they knew themselves saved or newborn. Salvation and renewal could not be caused by a power other than that of God, not by the baptismal water, nor by hearing the words of the Bible. In this manner the sacraments and the written Word of God were sometimes underestimated by the spiritualists. The only important thing for them was the mystical and personal experience of the living Lord.

The word "spiritualistic" also deals with the spirit of man. Therefore persons of spiritualistic persuasion were convinced that the church could not be grounded upon anything but the spiritual community of men. Neither a confession of faith nor an ecclesiastical polity, but only the influence of the Holy Spirit upon the spirit of man might be the real foundation of any church. The Holy Spirit bound spiritual people together into a congregation; He gathered His church. Consequently the spirit of the congregation had to be genuinely and often experienced. The Spirit was invisible and unmeasurable but it was the most essential factor in church life. A true church was considered to be the realization of the presence of the Holy Spirit. Therefore spiritualists refused to submit to any confession of faith, because human words always give inadequate expression to religious feelings. It was their conviction that life must always transcend the formulation of it. The Holy Spirit alone had the right to reign over their hearts. Consequently their churches could not be institutional and their ministers had no authority. Everyone might be his own priest; their congregations were free churches, voluntary communities.[4]

One may ask what they believed about the Bible. The answer is simple. The Book of Books was the Holy Book, not because it was the Word of God in the strict sense of the word, but because it comprised the words of God. Spiritualists did not worry about texts with which they could accuse others of heresy. They lived by the spirit of the Bible and anyone who desired to live by that spirit was considered a fellow Christian. This spirit had taken shape in Christ, the still living Christ. In this sense one could say that the spirit of the Bible was identical with the Holy Spirit, and that the Word of God had become flesh. But it not only dwelt among mankind in the historic Christ, but was still dwelling among them.[5]

Ernst Troeltsch and Karl Holl, German historians, differed on whether or not the Anabaptists were spiritualistic Christians.

[4] J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink en J. Lindeboom: *Handboek der Kerkgeschiedenis* II ('sGravenhage, 1946) 76-79.

[5] J. H. Maronier, *Het inwendig woord* (Amsterdam, 1890) 17.

Troeltsch refused to reckon them among these, although he saw many points of agreement. He designated them as Biblicistic community-Christians (*Gemeinde-Christen*). Among the Swiss Brethren he discovered very many typically Scriptural features, and so many well-organized communities that he could not identify them with the mystical spiritualists.[6] On the other hand, Holl observed that the Anabaptist communities were voluntary congregations of autonomous believers, emphasizing the individual, and that their obedience to the Scriptures was caused by the inner voice of the Holy Spirit. He stated that they could not recognize the written word of the Scriptures as the divine Word, unless they were enlightened by the Holy Spirit. Therefore he designated the Anabaptists as mystical spiritualistic Christians.[7]

We do not need to choose. Dutch Mennonitism manifests features of spiritualistic religion. Sometimes this type of religion seemed to be shunned, sometimes even to be destroyed. But it was present from the beginning and it often raised its head; it was revived and it conquered. The spiritualistic trend is clear in the history of the Dutch Mennonites, though we cannot designate the brotherhood as a whole as a spiritualistic one.

The spiritualistic features were present from the beginning. It is well known that Anabaptism in every country where it existed accommodated itself to the national character, at least that it took on features of the national attitude toward religious truths.[8] The Dutch national character possessed spiritualistic features. The influence of the *Imitation of Christ,* attributed to Thomas à Kempis, has been greater than many people supposed.[9] It was written in Holland. In the second chapter of the third book it says very clearly: "Let not Moses or some prophet speak unto me, but speak Thou Thyself unto me, O Lord. Thou alone canst, without them, teach me perfectly, whilst they cannot do anything without Thine inspiration; they let us hear the sound of the words, but they do not communicate the Spirit." This states clearly how highly the author appreciated the immediate contact with God. Another quotation: "When Jesus is with us, everything is well, and nothing is difficult, but when He is absent everything is hard for us; when Jesus does not speak to us in our hearts, every consolation remains

[6] Ernst Troeltsch, *Die Soziallehren der Christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen* (Tübingen, 1923) 863-65.

[7] Karl Holl, *Luther und die Schwärmer* (Tübingen, 1927) 420-67.

[8] W. J. Kühler, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden in de zestiende eeuw* (Haarlem, 1932) 5 f.

[9] Kühler, *op. cit.,* 25 f.

poor, but when Jesus speaks one word only, one receives a rich consolation."[10]

We may notice that at least one martyr, Peter Witses Metselaar, gives an echo to this living word of God. Asked to state the common conviction among the Mennonites about baptism, he answered: "What do I know about my brother's convictions? I can tell you what God has given to me, that is the thing I know!"[11] It is remarkable that the martyrs again and again emphasized the fact that they did not derive their faith from Zwingli or Luther, neither from Augustine nor even from Menno Simons.[12] They received it from God Himself.[13] This fact indicates the same spiritualistic tendency. In regard to the second quotation from the *Imitation,* the reference to the living Christ, the prologue of the *Offer des Heeren,* the first collection of letters from and verdicts against the martyrs, expresses it in this way: Jesus has been unknown for several centuries, but at present He has become alive before the eyes of the consciences of the Christians."[14] Besides, the living Christ is the Head, Captain, and Master of every Mennonite martyr. This is stated again and again, and He is not Lord on the basis of His written Word, but on the ground of His really experienced presence.

There is another man who had great influence on the religious conceptions of the Dutch people and consequently on those of the Dutch Mennonites, Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466?-1536). He stated that a strong faith had to be founded on the promises of Christ, and he emphasized that Christ was willing to gather a new people. In this way he describes the church as the invisible league of Christians, allying themselves in one spirit with their chief, Christ. His ideas about the sacraments are particularly important for us. He describes them as ceremonies; they can be helps to piety, but one must not overestimate their importance. Baptism is the covenant with God. The communion service signifies eating and drinking in a purely spiritual manner. One can understand why several historians have stated that these ideas look suspiciously like the convictions of the Anabaptists who had come to Holland about this time.[15]

On innumerable occasions the martyrs speak about the prom-

[10] *The Imitation of Christ* II, 8.
[11] *Offer des Heeren,* 438.
[12] *Ibid.,* 222, 300 f.
[13] *Ibid.,* 307 f., 584.
[14] *Ibid.,* 53.
[15] J. Huizinga, *Erasmus* (Haarlem, 1936) Book 1, 191 f. J. Lindeboom, *Erasmus, onderzoek naar zijn theologie* (Leiden, 1909) 130.

ises of Christ. One example may suffice here: Jeronimus Segersz consoles his wife with the glorious promises of Christ during her imprisonment with him.[16] In the same way the martyrs believed the church to be the league of agreeing Christians, and they very seldom used the word sacraments. The word is used by Jorian Simons only.[17] They all refused to speak about the "Holy Supper." "You mean the breaking of the bread," said Jacques d' Auchy.[18] And it is well known that they were convinced that one had to partake of the flesh and blood of Christ spiritually and symbolically.

There was a third man who was influential: Dirk Volkertzoon Coornhert (1522-90). He desired but one thing: that the living Word, Jesus Christ, should reveal Himself to the human spirit. He stated that genuine religion is independent of form and letter. It proves its truth by making the human nature equal to that of Christ. Faith is a voluntary acceptance of the living Word of God. Therefore the sacraments are not able to give salvation. True baptism is to be baptized by the Holy Spirit, not in water, but in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. Highly important is his concept of the church. He reproaches the reformers and also Menno Simons with laying too much emphasis on outer things. They believe that their particular churches are the true church of Christ; this is pride and prejudice. None of the existing churches can be the genuine church, for the true apostolic church consists of all persons who have confessed their faith in God as heavenly Father and in Jesus Christ as His holy Ambassador. These true Christians shun sin.[19] Coornhert was the friend of Hans de Ries (1553-1638), the leader of the Waterlander Mennonites.[20] De Ries's conception of the church has influenced a large part of the Mennonites. His confession of faith was written in 1610, a long time before the Flemish confessions. It states that the genuine church consists of all true Christians regardless of where they may live on the earth.[21] It is extremely important to remember the name of Coornhert if one wishes to understand the Dutch Mennonites, particularly if one intends to learn why they

16 *Offer des Heeren,* 131.

17 *Ibid.,* 261.

18 *Ibid.,* 278.

19 B. Becker, *Coornhert, de zestiende eeusche Apostel der volmaakbaarheid,* in *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* XIX ('sGravenhage, 1926) 59-84.

20 He dedicated his *Uutroedinghe van des vernunfts plantinghe* to Hans de Ries; B. Becker, *op. cit.,* 83.

21 *Korte Belijdenis des Geloofs der Voornaamste stucken der Christelijke Leere, opgesteld door Hans de Rys en Lubbert Gerritsz,* in H. Schijn, *Geschiedenis der Mennoniten* I (Amsterdam, 1743) 263.

place only a relative value on the church. The Waterlanders were only a part of the Dutch brotherhood, but a very important part, and the Flemish began to share their convictions beginning about 1660.

Nevertheless Anabaptism in the Netherlands remained Anabaptism. Though the typical form was determined by the soil on which it grew, it brought essential features with it when it came to Holland, which were not genuinely Dutch. Again the names of three men should be mentioned who determined the form. Their contribution to the convictions of Dutch Mennonitism is undeniable; features of their leading thoughts can be observed in Dutch Mennonitism.

In the first place then note Melchior Hofmann (1495-1543). Though he visited the Low Countries, the earliest Mennonite communities were instigated by the preaching of his messenger, Jan Volkertszoon Tripmaker, who brought the convictions of Hofmann to Amsterdam.[22] Hofmann is known by two ideas: his doctrine of the incarnation and his chiliastic expectation. As for the incarnation he believed that salvation was worked out by Christ, who was entirely divine and did not possess anything human. Therefore Jesus did not recieve His body from Mary but brought it from heaven. Just as the heavenly dew falls into an oystershell and changes into a pearl without taking anything from the oyster (according to the beliefs of the time), Jesus had gone through Mary; or to use another metaphor: Just as a beam of sunlight passes through the window without taking anything from the glass, just so Jesus remained divine without taking on humanity from man. Hofmann held God to be a Spirit and likewise Christ too. He stated further that in the communion service the heavenly Bridegroom comes to His bride, the believing soul, and gives her the tokens of His love. Man's soul is in Christ and Christ is in the soul, he said.[23]

Every church historian knows that early Dutch Mennonites differed from all other Christians by this conviction about the incarnation. This conviction is not only defended by many of them but even the same terminology is employed. Peter van Wervick insists on the clear distinction of the doctrine when he writes to his coreligionists from prison.[24] In later times the Mennonites dropped Hofmann's doctrine of the incarnation, but in the beginning it was one of the most essential features of their faith.

[22] Kühler, *op. cit.*, 63-68.
[23] W. J. Leendertz, *Melchior Hofmann* (Haarlem, 1883) 72, 80, 127, 128, 168.
[24] *Offer des Heeren*, 188.

Hofmann's conception of the sacraments was influenced by his chiliasm. He believed in an imminent return of the Lord. Christ was expected to come back to earth and gather the faithful around Him. Inclusion in the gathering depended not on baptism, but only on faith. In consequence, Hofmann postponed outward baptism for two years when it appeared too dangerous to be baptized with the true baptism of faith. He postponed the ceremony although he expected the return of the Lord at any moment. His chiliasm also influenced his conviction about the church. The church was the community of all those who longed for the restitution by Christ. The moment Christ returned, the churches would no longer be necessary; they could pass away. At the Great Restitution the true worshipers would worship in spirit and truth. The Restitution would make every institution superfluous.[25]

This Hofmannistic chiliasm we observe among the Dutch Mennonites. There was a dispute regarding whether one had to wait until the kingdom of God decended from heaven, or if one had to realize it himself as an obedient servant of God. Jacob van Campen, an elder at Amsterdam, and Menno Simons rejected Jan van Leyden's vision on this matter. Both were inclined to wait patiently for the Lord's return.[26] In the meantime baptism was to be an answer of a good conscience to God. I Pet. 3:21.[27] Jorian Simons states it this way: "We want to be limbs of the body of Christ."[28] Claesken: "One cannot be saved by an outer token."[29] Elisabeth: "All the water of the ocean will not save me, salvation is only by Christ."[30] For Jorian Simons the community is not an institution when he speaks of the little flock, "who have brought *their* whole attitude in harmony with the commandments of God."[31] The plural form used by Jorian is significant. Had he considered the church meritorious, he would have used the singular: "the flock which has brought *its* attitude."

In the second place note Denk (1495-1527). His influence is observable, though his name is seldom mentioned. His connection here is clear, if one remembers that he did not agree with the ecclesiastical dogma that came to the fore after the first years of the movement. Denk was baptized by Balthasar Hubmaier, never-

25 Kühler, *op. cit.*, 68.
26 *Ibid.*, 111, 141, 151, 152, 165, 166.
27 Menno Symons, *Opera omnia theologica* (Amsterdam, 1681) fol. 14b.
28 *Offer des Heeren*, 265.
29 *Ibid.*, 326.
30 *Ibid.*, 93.
31 *Ibid.*, 261.

theless he stated that whoever lacked the outer ceremony did not need to lack anything essential. He considered it better to be without the ceremonies than to abuse them. He judged confessions of faith in the same way. He forbade the use of violence upon the conscience. Confessions were human expressions for matters which in reality were inexpressible. He applied this point of view to the Bible too. He liked to interpret the Scriptures allegorically. He was one of the first theologians who publicly pointed out the contradictions in the Scriptures, such as: "I will not keep my anger forever" (Jer. 3:12), and "They will go away into eternal punishment" (Matt. 25:46). Hans Denk preferred the spirit of the Bible to the letter. The spirit of the Scriptures he indicated as the Inner Word, and he denied that an outer word could save mankind. Only the Inner Word had the power to do so.[32]

As for Denk's conviction concerning the sacrament, I need not mention more than I have above. But in regard to his denial of confessions of faith, it must be stated first of all that the early Dutch Anabaptists-Mennonites did not have stated formulas. The earliest were written after the years of martyrdom were over (the Waterlander 1577, the Concept of Cologne 1591). Before that time everyone confessed his own belief individually. Adriaen Pan declared that he repented and confessed his sins and then trusted the mercy of God.[33] That they confessed personal belief appears in the formation given by Hans Keescooper (Jannijn Buefkijn): an anonymous young man related that the preacher who was examining him for baptism considered him to be too young in understanding, and advised postponement of baptism.[34] It is important to note that the preacher did not even mention a formula as a standard, but judged subjectively the youth's personal belief.

In the third place, note Michael Sattler (?-1527). His letter to the congregation at Horb (1527), written during his imprisonment, was quickly brought to Holland and printed in a Dutch translation as early as 1560.[35] The seven Schleitheim Articles, of which Sattler was the main author, were also well known in the Low Countries. In his letter he warns against overestimating the leading of the Holy Spirit, which might lead the brethren to excesses. On the other hand, he emphasizes that they should not deny the inspiration of the Spirit, but he adds: "Let nobody remove the

[32] L. Keller, *Ein Apostel der Wiedertäufer* (Leipzig, 1882) 66-72.
[33] *Offer des Heeren*, 344.
[34] *Ibid.*, 122.
[35] *Nederlandsche Anabaptistica*, ed. S. Cramer, in *B.R.N.* IV ('sGravenhage, 1909) 585.

boundaries laid by the Scriptures."[36] This expression describes exactly what we observe among the Dutch Mennonites: the Scriptures are the limits, the means for supervision. I suppose this is the characteristic of Biblicism observed by Troeltsch among the early Anabaptists. Later I hope to say more about this highly interesting question.

The second remarkable fact is that Sattler states in the seventh of the Schleitheim Articles that Christ teaches the completeness of the law.[37] Indeed, we can observe a kind of legalism among the Dutch Mennonites. The Sermon on the Mount was considered as the new rule for Christians. Abundant are the arguments that they sought to obey this divine law strictly.

But here was a dangerous threat to the spiritualistic tendency in Dutch Mennonitism. To the extent that they were being driven into a corner by persecution and were earnestly longing for the Lord's Day, in which the wicked world would be transformed into the kingdom of heaven, the Mennonites began to wonder whether they had the right to believe that they were the chosen ones. There was only one obvious answer for them: when one conforms to the standards of the Bible, he is a true Christian. Consequently Menno Simons and Dirk Philips listed six,[38] and seven[39] characteristics of the genuine church. I shall not say that these elders did not reckon with the working of the Holy Spirit, but I must state that their followers forgot that there is only one correct standard—a standard not determined by texts but by the living Lord Himself. In the same way they began to think about the ordaining of ministers. The official ordination by laying on of hands became more important than the calling by God's own voice. Of course it is not possible to test this true calling, for just which fact gives assurance that a minister is really called by the Lord? Menno hesitated a long time before he felt confident that the calling by the brethren was the calling of God.[40] But when he had to justify his ordination to Gellius Faber he declared that the proof is a blameless attitude and the ability to teach the Gospel.[41] But just what is a blameless attitude and what is this ability? When pressed to explain his answer he enumerated the standards, which of course consist of

[36] *Ibid.*, 615.
[37] *Ibid.*, 611.
[38] Menno's *Opera*, fol. 300b, 301a.
[39] *De geschriften van Dirk Philipsz*, ed. F. Pijper, in *B.R.N.* X ('sGravenhage, 1914) 393-407.
[40] Menno, *Opera*, fol. 258a.
[41] *Ibid.*, 241a-b.

Bible texts, but in a nutshell: the genuine church gives birth to the true ministers.[42]

In the same way the view regarding baptism was dependent on the view of the church. Only the true church baptizes in the right way. Therefore the Flemish rebaptized the Waterland Mennonites, when receiving them into fellowship.[43]

Two elders were bitterly grieved to observe these facts, and they were not of the least of the church leaders. In Germany it was Christian Entfelder, in Holland, Obbe Philips. Both are too little known among Mennonites. Entfelder wrote a book, *The Manifold Schisms Caused in the Year 1530*. He regretted deeply that so many divisions existed among Christians. Each, he said, wants to be a master of the Holy Spirit instead of the Holy Spirit being the only master of the Christians. Everywhere theological systems are set up and consequently walls are built between the churches. He thought that no one should be permitted to accept a ministerial office without a divine order. Nowadays there is an innumerable herd of preachers, he says, but who has called them? If they say that their calling is Scriptural, he replies that the written word of the Bible only has to bear witness of the living Word. The written word is not contrary to the living Word, but is its slave; the living Word is the Lord. In order to have the opportunity to listen to the living Word, he left the Anabaptist church, for the living Word did not tell him unmistakably that he, Entfelder, was called to the ministry.[44] An identical event took place in Holland with the man who ordained Menno Simons. Obbe Philips, Dirk's brother, left the brotherhood about ten years after Entfelder. The reason is clear when we study his writing, the title of which can be translated *Repentance*. The Mennonites claim, he said, that nobody can be saved unless he belongs to the brotherhood and submits to its regulations. Formerly, that is before this tendency appeared, the Mennonites only wanted to serve God in simplicity. A second point in his book is important too: at the time when he himself was ordained, he did hear the sacred words, and he did feel the imposition of human hands, but—these are his own words—"we did not feel or hear the Holy Spirit." This reference is very significant. Hereafter follows his most accusing expression: "The letter of the Scriptures imprisoned us."[45]

[42] *Ibid.*, 240b, 241a.

[43] Kühler, *op. cit.*, 303.

[44] C. Entfelder, *Bedenckinge over de veelderley scheuringe ende dwalinge in des laatste en verwerde tijden*, ed. P. Serarius (Amsterdam, 1659); *Besluytrede*, 19 f.

[45] Obbe Philipsz, *Bekentenisse*, ed. S. Cramer, in *B.R.N.* VII ('sGravenhage, 1910) 130, 135.

Thus two of the most perceptive spirits of Mennonitism withdrew from the church; the corrective against literalism disappeared with these two noble representatives of spiritualism.

Nevertheless the spiritualistic tendency could not be suppressed though the leading of the congregations came into the hands of elders who kept the word of the Bible as the only foundation of their church, even though they said that they did not like to lay a foundation other than the one already laid. Menno's emphasis on the clearly expressed commandment of Christ[46] and the ringing letter of the New Testament is well known.[47] But perhaps his followers have interpreted these expressions in a different sense, and perhaps Menno meant them lest strictly than he wrote them down. He has some typical spiritualistic expressions as well. For instance: "Truth is not known to anybody but to him who is taught and enlightened by the Holy Spirit."[48] In the same way he recognizes that outer baptism cannot save and is no more than an indication of obedience.[49] But such expressions of a limited kind of spiritualism are few. He gives the impression that he considers the written words as the divine Word.

Probably Dirk Philips was much more spiritualistically minded than Menno Simons. At least he states that it is impossible to understand Christ's doctrine, much less adhere to it, unless by the working of the Holy Spirit. "Nobody possesses the Holy Spirit but he who is spiritually minded."[50] I think this quotation is unmistakable. As a sequel to this he describes faith as an inner understanding of the Scriptures, caused by outer hearing in co-operation with and the enlightening of the Holy Spirit.[51] Consequently he describes the church as an alliance of believing Christians with God, but this alliance is bound only to Jesus Christ. It is the Holy Spirit who assures us that we are children of God. In the same way he explains that God brings about, by His Spirit only, the things implied by the sacraments.[52]

But enough of the two great leaders, Menno and Dirk. Reading the writings of Dirk and those of Menno to a certain extent also, we are astonished that Dutch Mennonitism could develop into such a legalistic and literalistic movement as it was at the turn

[46] Menno, *Opera,* fol. 17a.
[47] *Ibid.,* 437a.
[48] *Ibid., Voorrede, Fundamentboek,* fol. 3.
[49] *Ibid.,* fol. 14b.
[50] Dirk Philipsz, *op. cit.,* 215.
[51] *Ibid.,* 226.
[52] *Ibid.,* 102.

of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The question rises: How could it happen? The logical consequence of these ideas was bound to be spiritualistic. The congregations should have considered themselves as mere human gatherings of persons led by the Holy Spirit; it should have been expected that the Mennonite congregations of Holland should never become institutional churches, dictating to their members what they had to believe and how to act. It was obvious that they never would have possessed binding statements or confessions of faith, had they followed the initial line. We should expect a similar position on baptism also. The later Mennonites of Holland should have observed it as an indication of participation in a general and widespread Christianity, a church transcending the visible Mennonite communities. We should have expected the communion services to open to everyone who wished to attend, that is, to join the brotherhood of believers and to search for the *unio mystica* with the living Christ. This did not happen.

I have referred to the custom of rebaptizing members coming from one branch to another. The communion service was also considered as a ceremony to which only the baptized members of the immediate congregation were admitted. Worst of all, the priesthood of all believers was only theoretically maintained; the church officials were given authority. The difference of office between elders or bishops and preachers was accepted, and in several branches there was a distinction between the common members of the congregation and the ordained officials. In the beginning the movement had refused to recognize any priest but Christ Himself, but around 1600 the laymen were distinguished from the ministers.[53]

Let us search for the reasons causing this absolute change of mind, and see whether or not every division of the Mennonites followed this course. The first reason is that there were members who wanted a fixed pattern in the strict sense of the term. This is understandable in the light of the confusion of the times, when the Dutch were struggling against Spain for freedom of conscience. The Dutch Mennonites sacrificed their lives for their personal faith. But at the same time Calvinism entered into the Low Countries, and Calvinism offered an absolute fixed pattern in matters of religion. The Mennonites, convinced that they were right in their ideas about nonswearing of oaths, nonresistance, and adult baptism, were inclined to be just as certain about the other articles of their faith. The abundant freedom with which Christ had set them

[53] W. J. Kühler, *Het Socinianisme in Nederland* (Leiden, 1912) 163.

free became a heavy burden for the laymen. They asked their leaders for more formulas of faith and practice. There is a second reason: the eager zeal of the leaders. But their zeal was gratified because the members of the congregation accepted their authority. About sixty years later one of the leaders ascertained that laymen were unable to discern, i.e., understand and decide, issues in the congregations.[54] The members permitted themselves to be docile servants of the ministers. I shall not say as a result of love of ease, but I dare say as a result of spiritual fatigue.

The spiritual inertia of the members and the eagerness of the leaders worked together to change the concept of the church. Nowhere can this be seen as clearly as in the writings of Menno Simons. In his early books the church is mentioned only incidentally. In his first treatise, the one pertaining to the *Spiritual Resurrection,* he did not say anything more about the church than that those who have risen with Christ to a new life are the holy church. The divine Word, which is possessed by the church, leads people to rebirth.[55] He indicates more clearly the value of the church in his booklet *The New Creature.* It was Dr. W. J. Kühler who discovered the changing of his mind in two printings of the booklet. In the first edition Menno asks: "Can an unbelieving or disobedient man have the promise of eternal life?" In the second edition he has changed the question into: "Can such a man participate in the kingdom of Christ and His church?"[56] The church gradually became more important for Menno. At the end of his life he exclaimed that he had not loved anything on earth as much as the church.[57]

This change can be described in this way: in the beginning the congregation was the gathering of those who were converted and knew themselves saved. But the church became an institution mediating conversion and salvation and in the end it was believed that there could not be any conversion or salvation outside of it.

It is known that the first schism in the Low Countries took place in 1555. The disputed points were the ban and shunning. Mennonites accepted the fact that the church or regenerated people had to be spotless and stainless. They were convinced that the new birth was revealed by the attitudes and behavior of the Christians. Therefore, when anything reproachable appeared in the life of a

[54] *Versoeck en voorslag eeniger Broederen* (Amsterdam, 1661) 2.
[55] Menno, *Opera,* fol. 180b, 183a, 184a.
[56] Kühler, *op. cit.,* 218.
[57] Menno, *Opera,* fol. 392a.

member, it was proof that such a member only imagined himself to be reborn, and as a matter of fact was not really converted. In consequence he could no longer belong to the blameless church; he had to be warned three times, the first time secretly, the second in the midst of his family, and the third time before the congregation. If he refused to improve his attitude, he had to be banned, which act was performed by the elder or elders in the name of the church; and he had to be shunned by the other members of the congregation.[58] The belief existed that whenever Christ should return He somewhere would find a church in which He might dwell. By an understandable overestimation of their own merits, the Mennonites intended that His dwelling place should be their own congregation. Were they not persecuted? Persecution was the proof that they were the genuine church of the Lord.[59] In consequence they had to separate themselves from the worldly people. That a blameless co-operation with the world might be justified by the Lord they were not able to imagine. Obbe Philips describes this naïve standpoint as follows: "We were convinced that by separating ourselves from the Papists, Lutherans, and Zwinglians all would be well."[60] But there is only one short step between separation from others and contempt of others. And it went so far that the Mennonites despised everyone who was not precisely conformed to them.

The disputed point in the schism of 1555 was a moral question. We do not know what serious mistake the husband of Swaen Rutgers made; we even do not know his name. But the blame must have been placed on him by the congregation, otherwise Lenaert Bouwens would not have been able to ban him. Among the members who were asked to shun him was his wife, Swaen Rutgers. The logical consequence of the ban was that she also had to shun her husband, but she refused and as a result was also excommunicated by Bouwens. A part of the congregation at Emden thought it too hard a measure.[61]

They asked the judgment of Menno Simons. Menno wrote a letter in which he stated that he did not give his consent to Bouwens' action.[62] But Bouwens was a die-hard; he threatened to excommuni-

[58] Kühler, *op. cit.*, 298.

[59] S. Hoekstra, *Beginselen en Leer der Oude Doopsgezinden* (Amsterdam, 1863) 182 f.

[60] Obbe Philipsz, *op. cit.*, 127.

[61] *Het beginsel en voortganck der geschillen, scheuringen en verdeeltheden onder degene die Doopsgesinden genoemt worden,* in *B.R.N.* VII, 532 f.

[62] Menno, *Brief aan de Gemeente te Emden,* in *Successio Anabaptistica, B.R.N.* VII, 58 f.

cate Menno too. Menno capitulated in unmistakable weakness. It seemed that Bouwens, and Dirk Philips who agreed with him, had conquered.[63] But happily there were others who refused to obey the two elders. They were excommunicated. From that time on the Mennonites of Holland were divided into Flemish and Waterlanders. The Flemish insisted on banning and shunning; the Waterlanders required more liberal action and employed excommunication only for more serious offenses.[64] From this moment the Flemish considered themselves to be the true Mennonites, and it will be evident that they in particular proclaimed a concept of the church as the institution for salvation. It is equally clear that they should emphasize the correct celebration of the sacraments, and that they should consider their confessions of faith as an authoritative summary of Biblical truth.

The Waterlanders did not take this direction. I already have mentioned the fact that they were the first to compose a confession of faith. This is true, but they had a special reason for doing so. It grieved the Waterlanders, and in particular their leader Hans de Ries, that the Mennonite brotherhood had been divided. They tried to unify it by means of expounding the things most surely believed. In respect to these points they meant to be at one with the others. Whosoever agreed with these articles, the authors naïvely thought, would regret the schism and seek unity.[65] I say naïvely because they described the church as the gathering of Christians called on a personal, individual basis: "Concerning the church of God, we confess that all people on earth, having attained by mercy the renewal of the inner man by the power of God [these words are the commonly used paraphrase of reference to the Holy Spirit] and in which is found the proper nature and mind of Christ, are the true members of the congregation of Jesus Christ."[66] Here it is important to remember the description of the church by Coornhert. This definition was of course too unlimited for the Flemish. They believed, at least for the present, that their communities were the church of Christ, because they conformed to the measures of the New Testament, which Menno and Dirk Philips had enumerated. Some of them did not want to exclude the Waterlanders, at least as individual Christians, from the church of God, but the whole polity of the

[63] H. Alenson, *Tegenbericht op de voorreden vant groote Martelaerboeck, B.R.N.* VII, 258 f.

[64] *Successio Anabaptistica,* 54 f.

[65] Kühler, *op. cit.,* 356.

[66] E. M. ten Cate, *De eerste Waterlandsche Belijdenis,* in *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen* (Leiden, 1904) 152.

Waterland congregations was too loose for them.[67] They longed for a holy church. Therefore Lenaert Bouwens reprimanded the Waterlanders, calling them a "dung cart" because he despised them as mere superficial and wordly people, who were disobedient to the Lord.[68] But this accused branch was the only one that succeeded in keeping itself undivided. The Flemish separated from the Frisians in 1570 because of the extreme authority of Dirk Philips among the Frisians. Within the space of twenty years they themselves split up into two branches; the Old and the New Flemish, or the Thomas Byntgesvolk and the Jacob Keestvolk (1586-87).

In the same way the Frisians split into the harsh and moderate groups of the Thys and Lubbert Gerritsvolk (1589). The harsh Frisians divided further in 1598 into the Pieter Jeltjesvolk and the Jan Jacobsgezinden.[69] But the Waterlanders kept their unity, as far as I can grasp the situation, by maintaining the main features of spiritualism. The church was never considered an institution for salvation, but rather a league of Christians who were individually called, and who had renewed their lives before they joined the church. Baptism for the Waterlanders meant incorporation in the only genuine church, which was the invisible one, only known by God and composed of all true and faithful believers. They therefore never rebaptized members of other denominations who wanted to join their brotherhood. The communion service was not a closed meeting, that is to say, only open for the baptized members of their own congregation. And their confession, even the one later written by Hans de Ries and Lubbert Gerrits in order to unite the moderate Frisians and the Waterlanders, never was authoritative for the faith of the group.[70] They quoted with deep approval St. Paul's words "Let everyone be fully convinced in his own mind" (Rom. 14:5). Another saying was, "Each Christian has to be the proper interpreter of his own statements."[71]

In searching further for spiritualistic movements and tendencies, we must first consider the Waterlanders. Here we discover again and again the features of the spiritualistic position. Kühler several times points to mysticism among them. In their confession of faith Hans de Ries and Lubbert Gerrits state: "The new birth

[67] *Verhaal vant gene verhandelt ende besloten is in de bijeenkomste tot Leyden* (Amsterdam, 1661,) 30-33.

[68] *Successio Anabaptistica,* 55.

[69] Kühler, *op. cit.,* 399-419; 426-35.

[70] Archives of the Vereenigde Doopsgezinde Gemeente te Amsterdam, No. A 700; cf. Hoekstra, *op. cit., Voorrede,* VIII-X, also S. F. Rues, *Tegenwoordige Staet der Doopsgezinden* (Amsterdam, 1745) 88-90.

[71] *Waterlandtsche Gemeyntes Vredespresentatie* (Amsterdam, 1648) 5.

is wrought in us by means of the illuminating powers of the Holy Spirit and nothing physical."[72] That is unequivocal. Neither the church, nor the ministers, nor a confession of faith, nor water, bread and wine cause a renewal; it is the Spirit only.

An anonymous writer of the Waterlander persuasion says in his *Necessary Justification*: "The faithful, participating worthily in the communion service, do receive Jesus Christ with all His benefits and holy merits."[73] We may perhaps say that this is a more optimistic description than most of the Flemish gave. Samuel Apostool describes the communion as signifying the forgiveness of sins.[74] Surely this is true too, but it is a matter of emphasis. The Waterlanders, also, were aware of their sinfulness, but they emphasized sanctification by Christ's spiritual presence. The Flemish conception emanates from the idea of the satisfaction made by the historical act of Christ's death on the cross.

Only once did a severe dispute occur among the followers of Hans de Ries. He led them leniently but steadily, and the dispute did not result in a schism. Nittert Obbes, one of the ministers at Amsterdam, desired to bind himself and his fellow members to the "written Word of God," fearing the danger of exaltation if one gave himself to immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit. He could only think of extremes. He said the Mennonites had to entrust themselves to either literalism or spiritualism in the extreme forms.

Obbes probably was not aware of earlier Mennonite history, and if he was, he had forgotten Sattler's words about the boundary laid by the Scriptures, which was repeated in various forms in his own group.

When Obbes emphasized only the written Word as the divine Word, it was more than the Waterlanders could accept. They too believed in the Bible as the Word of God, but they distinguished the living Word, that was Christ, from the letter of Scripture. The written Word did not prevail over Christ. Anslo, Hesseling, and Wybrandts replied that living contact with God would be excluded if this relationship with Christ, which was the main matter of all religion, was broken. The tension resulted in sharp words. There ensued such a quarrel that Obbes' three fellow ministers kindly requested—not commanded—him to stay away from the communion service. However, there was no question of excommunication. Obbes finally capitulated, since it was explained that the living and

[72] Art. XXII, Schijn, *op. cit.*, 261.
[73] F. R.-K. S., *Noodwendighe verklaringhe* (Amsterdam, 1616) 53.
[74] S. Apostool en S. van Deyl, *Waarheydsoeffeningh* (Amsterdam, 1686) 28.

the written Word never could be contrary to each other because they both emanated from one and the same divine source. Thus the Waterlanders kept their unity.[75] The Waterlanders desired to have this unity with every other Mennonite branch in Holland. The anonymous brother who wrote the *Necessary Justification* did so to show the Flemish and Frisians that all the Mennonites could be one in faith. He said neither knowledge, nor creed, nor belief in the sense of fixed conviction are dear to God, but only love. And love ought to be the foundation of Christ's church. The disputes among the Mennonites pertained to certain points of faith and church organization, but nobody had the right to doubt that the members of the various groups loved God, at least when they were more than merely Christians in name.[76]

The *Necessary Justification* was one example of many efforts to foster unification. Jan de Witte tried to reach this goal in the same way; he wrote a *Book of Peace,* wherein he says that theological differences such as those about the Trinity, or about the oneness of the Father and the Son, keep believers at a distance from each other. Every Christian possessed at least a kind of faith, namely, faith to recognize the Son of God as his Master.[77] This *Book of Peace* was one more example of the spiritualistic attitude of the Waterlanders.

The finest example of this moderate attitude is to be found in Jan Philips Schabalje. He placed the Waterlander and Flemish confessions of faith in two columns in his book *The Union of the Principal Articles,* and he concluded that there was no difference between the essentials of the two confessions. He ends his treatise with the words: "When there is no schism between God and the soul, no schism can be maintained between the faithful. These things are joined together like a chain: one with God, one with men. At one here in this world, at one in the hereafter. The difference does not pertain to faith but to intellectual expression."[78]

In regard to this situation we can understand that Simeon Frederik Rues, the Lutheran minister who visited Holland about 1740 to get acquainted with the Mennonites, concluded that the Waterlanders regarded the Scriptures as their genuine confession of faith (a significant observation in more than one sense), that

[75] W. J. Kühler, *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden* 1600-1735 (Haarlem, 1940) 142-76.

[76] *Noodwendighe verklaringhe,* 14, 15, 27, 56.

[77] J. de Witte, *Vrede-schrift* (Amsterdam, 1638) 27 f.

[78] J. P. Schabalje, *Vereenigingh van de Principaale Artykelen des geloofs* (Rotterdam, 1739) 49-52.

they kept their brotherhood a church of "called" Christians and not of newborn saints, that they rejected the office of the elder, and maintained only "admonishers" (as the preachers were called in those days). These ministers, without exception, had the right to officiate in baptismal and communion services, without being expressly ordained for that purpose. They did not administer baptism as a meritorious rite and their communion service was not confined to members of the congregation. On the contrary, it was open even to people who did not agree with the particular articles of the confession of Hans de Ries. Everyone who considered himself on good terms with God was welcome.[79]

Incidentally I mentioned that the confession of faith of Hans de Ries and Lubbert Gerrits never was regarded as a binding statement, not even after the passing away of the beloved leaders.[80] It was rather a means of unification, and it served its purpose well. From time to time individual persons were glad to observe that it also described their personal faith, but it could be no more than this. Therefore it is not surprising that Prof. Kühler considers the Waterlanders (because of their spiritual mysticism) as the straight-line descendants of the original movement.[81] Nevertheless we must not forget that the other groups also kept a valuable heritage of the fathers: the longing for a church without spot or wrinkle, that it might be holy and without blame.

But when the efforts to keep the church blameless in a peculiar sense gave occasion to extremes, reactions took place against it from the side of the spiritualists. Among the Flemish, spiritualism perhaps came less to the fore, but it most certainly existed; and it blew the trumpet of criticism and opposition.

The second large schism took place in 1570 when the Flemish and the Frisians drifted apart. The cause was the fact that the authority of the elders increased too fast. Gradually Dirk Philips had become a man of power. He was called the "great Fleming." But he had not kept himself from extremism, and he wanted to demonstrate his authority. He excommunicated with "unbearable arrogance" everyone who did not submit to his will. A factor contributing to the new schism was the league of four congregations which was formed in Friesland; they had joined closely together in order to help each other in case of loss or absence of ministers. Dirk Philips did not like such an action without his knowledge. It

[79] Rues, *op. cit.*, 86, 87, 95, 104, 105, 112, 113.
[80] See note 70.
[81] Kühler, *op. cit.*, 375.

is not very important to determine how the schism was exactly brought about, but when it took place, there was at least one congregation that refused to take sides in the dispute. This was the congregation at Zierikzee.[82] It wanted to be Mennonite in the first place, and though it might be called Flemish, as opposed to the Waterlanders, it denied that the Frisians were more genuine Mennonites than the Flemish and vice versa. It declared it would remain neutral. Both the other groups then turned away from the neutrals, "still-standers." But this quiet pool was deep. In the same year of the schism, 1570, the Zierikzee brethren published a book in which they warned against the wrong direction being taken by the Mennonites. This book, *The Christian Examination,* or *Complaint About the Common Misery,* was printed three times. Some sixty years afterwards it came to light again at Haarlem, a proof that its contents had found approval.[83] But this book is not so much an appeal to unity as a thorough critique of developments in the Mennonite brotherhood. It will be shown that it is a critique from the spiritualistic wing of Dutch Mennonitism.

First they ask—for the treatise is in the form of an examination—if any genuine faith is observable among the Mennonites. They say: We mean faith in its quality and power and not only oral confession. Though no formulated confession was yet in existence, they ask: Is the church master over individual convictions? Nobody has the right to take the unique place of Christ; He only is able to reign over the conscience. Therefore nobody is allowed to judge another with some text from the Scriptures. The Zierikzee brethren would rather listen to God's Word in its power and spiritual essence (note the word) than to the letter only. I think this is decidedly spiritualistic. But every characteristic and distinctive quality of spiritualistic mysticism comes to the test in this Christian examination. They ask: Did we not boast too much of our outer religion and our visible ceremonies (note the word), such as baptism by water, the Holy Supper, washing of feet, etc.? These facts made us forget, they proceed to say, what the essence of the ceremonies was. And now the grimmest criticism is offered: We idolized these outward ceremonies—just as the Jews worshiped their outer temple and sacrifices—saying: "Here is the Lord's temple, here is the Lord's temple." Our love for God has been chilled. At the end of the book they say: Let us examine ourselves if we are righteous in faith, if Jesus Christ is still within

[82] *Beginsel en voortganck,* 542.

[83] *Een Christelijcke Proeve ende overlegginghe,* etc. (Haarlem, 1626) 31v., 32.

us (note the word), if we still possess the life that comes from God, and if we have not lost the power of the new birth.[84] For us modern students there is only one problem to solve now: how was it possible that this voice could sound so emphatically, and could be heard so often, if it were not because the congregations originally had possessed all these things, if it were not because the book appealed to the tendencies of early Anabaptism! Surely, the Flemish had tried to preserve the church of Christ blameless, and indeed, the original congregations had been close cohesive groups. That joyful fact they owed to the persecution. But such a cohesion would be hurt by such means as were used now. There had to be a quite different foundation for the cohesion: "We mean the faith in its quality and power," stated the Zierikzee brethren.[85] Unfortunately too little attention was paid to this criticism. It was to be a long time before a descendant of these men had influence, and restored the congregation to its original form. Before that time came the church was to become more and more the institution for salvation, and the board of elders were to be a kind of synod.

But criticism did not cease. And this time it was not heard within the congregations, but it sounded aloud from outside. The Calvinists liked to accuse the Mennonites of real or supposed heresies. We know about the dispute and about numerous Calvinistic writings pertaining to dogmas which offended the Mennonites. It was easier to offend the Flemish than the Waterlanders. The Calvinists had but little hold on the Waterlanders, who were less interested in dogmatic questions than the Flemish. To them, at most baptism was a matter for argument, since the Mennonites were not convinced that it had taken the place of the circumcision. Upon this basis the Calvinists justified infant baptism.[86] Of course the rejection of the oath and the practice of nonresistance were debatable, but the Waterlanders did not defend themselves as often as the Flemish. They didn't think it worth while. Only Jacob Anthony Roscius wrote an apology, not to solve theological problems, but in order to refute the charge of dissension.[87] The Waterlanders only asked for unity, as we have seen. But the Waterlanders felt the spiritualistic difference from the Calvinists too

[84] *Ibid.*, 10, 11, 12, 18.

[85] *Ibid.*, 10.

[86] The most informative one is Abr. a Dooreslaer en P. J. Austrosylvius, *Grondighe ende clare vertooninge*, etc. (Enkhuizen, 1637) 505-79.

[87] A. J. Roscius, *Babel, dat is verwerringhe der Kinderdooperen onder malcanderen* (n.p., 1626).

deeply to argue seriously with them. They stood too far apart from the Biblicism of Calvin and his followers; they did not regard the Scriptures as an arsenal of texts, to prove their group to be right. They used the Book of Books as the revelation of the Spirit in which they might live.

The Calvinistic offensive against the Flemish took place on two fronts. Of course one was the dogmatic front: the colloquia (debates) at Emden and Leeuwarden pertained to the dogmas of the Trinity, the church, the ministry, the washing of feet, and the resurrection of the dead. As we struggle through the long-winded discussions, we note how weak the Flemish were in respect to the theological articles. Surely, they believed they had a faith in consonance with the "Christianity of all centuries" (as one is accustomed to say today), but the creed of the Flemish was unskilled orthodoxy.[88] They too accepted the Scriptures without much ado about a system. This is the reason why the Calvinists reproached them for having merely strung together Bible texts instead of having built a theological system.[89]

Again and again the Flemish show that they neglected to follow the consequences of their convictions. The debates compelled them to undertake this labor, and afterwards, from the moment they had thought things out, they stated them as binding for the church. In 1626 Jacques Outerman composed their first confession of faith; in 1630 it was followed by that of Jan Cents; in 1632 Adrian Cornelis, the elder of Dordrecht, described the faith of the Flemish in the statement so well known in America (18 Articles of Dordrecht). These three show—when compared—an increasing strictness, but they all are surpassed by the Frisian confession of faith of Pieter Jans Twisck (1617). This man was so naïve as to suppose that this formulated faith was the faith of the martyrs. Nevertheless the members of the congregation did not care about that as much as the leaders did. They were ridiculed by both the Roman Catholics and the Calvinists. And mockery is often a more efficacious weapon than reasonable arguments. Cunerus Petri, a theologian at Louvain, charges that the Mennonites are always walking with downcast eyes and he asks where that is commanded in the Scriptures. They are extremely fond of their plain clothes, he states, but that is certainly not a proof of genuine Christianity. And furthermore those precise expressions, as: I

[88] J. H. Wessel, *De leerstellige strijd tusschen Nederlandsche Gereformeerden en Doopsgezinden in de 16e eeuw* (Assen, 1945) 130.

[89] G. Udemans, *Noodighe verbeteringhe,* etc. (Zierikzee, 1620) 7.

hope to do this or that tomorrow, instead of saying: tomorrow I am going to do something! That is carrying the piety of St. James' letter to extremes. The critic would appreciate it, if it improved true piety, but it only increases the number of divisions.[90] In the same way Jean Taffin, a Calvinist of French origin, accuses the Mennonites of hanging their heads, mournful faces, sighing, speaking whiningly—and all this under the pretext of simplicity. This cannot be real piety; on the contrary they are haughty and conceited.[91] Another Calvinistic opponent states that they change the meaning of the Bible: It is not their faith that appears from their personality, but they like to show their personality from out of the outer form of their faith.[92] Such reproaches hurt. The Flemish Mennonites felt their truth. But instead of reforming their attitude, they remained proud of it. Numerous are the satires performed on the Amsterdam stage in which the precise Mennonites were ridiculed. In particular I remember the plays of Thomas Asselyn,[93] and the expression "a Mennonite sister," that means a hypocrite, and "the Mennonite lie," that means a saying which is in itself not untrue, but serves to hide the exact truth.[94]

All these charges hurt severely. And the Flemish were forced to solve the problem which was the essence of faith and morals. Claes Claesz, the Blokzijl elder, wrote the book that was for years the manual of doctrine among the Flemish: *The Confession of the Principal Points of the Christian Religion* (1624). It is remarkable that even he could not do entirely without spiritualistic mysticism. He states—as did the Amsterdam ministers in the case of Nittert Obbes—that the Holy Spirit co-operates with, in, and by the written Word of God, to save us. The Scriptures are the tests, regulators, and lines of conduct.[95] (This reminds one of Michael Sattler.) He designates the brotherhood as a church cleansed by the blood of Christ, who are at one with God, and are incorporated in the body of Christ. Therefore the local communities are parts of the general church of the living God. He says even more concisely: the invisible church is a gathering of persons, called by the

[90] Cunerus Petri, *Den Schilt teghen die Wederdoopers* (Leuven, 1568) 137.

[91] J. Taffin, *Onderwijsinghe teghens die dwalinghe der Wederdoopers* (Haarlem, 1590) 9 f.

[92] J. Tayus, *Proeve van de Leere der Wederdooperen* (Leiden, 1601) 19.

[93] Th. Asselijn, *Jan Klaaz of Gewande Dienstmaagd* (Amsterdam, n.d. [1682]); *Kraam-bedt of Kandeel-maal van Zaartje Jans* (Amsterdam, 1684); *Echtscheiding van Jan Klaasz en Saartje Jans* (Amsterdam, 1685).

[94] C. N. Wybrandts, *Het Menniste Zusje,* in *Zondagsbode* (Schagen, 1902) Aug. 17-Jan. 4.

[95] Claes Claes, *Bekentenisse van de voornaamste stucken des Christelijcken geloofs* (Amsterdam, 1624) 28.

Word of God to believe in Jesus Christ.[96] (Here we observe the influence of Coornhert.) He designates the sacraments as ceremonial commandments. Of course it would be too much to expect him to confess that he borrowed the expression from Erasmus. But this term shows that the Erasmian spirit had influenced him. And then they are commandments; they have to be obeyed, but they are not the medium for salvation. He states that in baptism and the communion we are admonished to obedience, and we receive the benefits of the Lord, but unless we receive them by faith, they are worthless.[97] Of course we must not expect him to open the communion service for people not baptized upon their faith, for that he is too Flemish; but when he emphasizes an individual self-examination before attending it, he seems to be a descendant of the Zierikzee brethren.

One might ask how this book could be accepted by the Flemish as a manual at the time when they started to become a confessional and somewhat conformistic people. That must be because the *members* had preserved the ancient convictions, and consequently it was the Flemish *members* who put value on the book, whilst the *leaders* did not talk much about it. But the spirit of the mystical attitude was reappearing in spite of the official ignorance.

There were four elders who had preserved the spiritualistic features. They were the four who wrote the *Olive Branch* Confession at Amsterdam in 1627. They were true Flemings no doubt; they too desired to protect the congregation against the so-called looseness of the Waterlanders, and therefore they maintained banning and shunning, and they wanted to make sure of the authority of the elders. But they were disturbed and alarmed by the question as to what is the genuine church of Christ. Of course they had an answer for themselves, but this answer deviated from the one given by most of the elders. Very carefully they started to ask what were the fundamentally certain characteristics of the true children of God. The fact that they did not mention the church is significant. Even more significant is the second question: Do the *Flemish only* possess these characteristics? Their own answer is implied in the question. The third question is the consequence of this answer: By what kind of things is the union with other Christians forbidden?[98]

It is not surprising that an answer failed to appear. The elders of the Flemish were afraid of a train of thought in which the

[96] *Ibid.*, 158.
[97] *Ibid.*, 166, 246.
[98] *Brief tot Vreed-bereydinge* (Amsterdam, 1636) 29 f.

individual believer was placed in the fore. By virtue of these questions the church appeared to be composed of individuals, not the individuals to be fashioned by the church. But since the answer failed to be written, the four Amsterdam elders gave their own statement. Their answer is the *Olive Branch,* which had much influence. This confession (and we understand by this word that the meaning of a writing like this one is not a statement of what ought to be believed, but a basis for peace negotiations) in the first place determines that there is only one characteristic of being a child of God, that is, faith working through love. Cautiously they say that faith is understood by the Word of God and is confirmed by the Holy Spirit, and that this medium of faith regenerates man. No honest Fleming would object to it, but its content has a more spiritualistic sense than the other confessions.

The distinction of the *Olive Branch* from all the other confessions is that the others were merely examined by the delegates to the church meetings where they met to discuss a possible unification, and were not published until afterwards, whereas the *Olive Branch* could be read and considered by all the members of the congregations, because it was published openly and immediately.[99] At this point Pieter Jan Twisck comes into the picture. He rejected the *Olive Branch* point-blank after three days of discussion at Zaandam. Likewise he refused to approve the Amsterdam confession, and he disliked the manual of Claes Claesz. The latter answered Twisck, and we should note, by the way, that he answered using an expression borrowed from Erasmus! In Italy, so the Rotterdam scholar had said, the people were docile enough, but the clergy failed. And in the same way, wrote Claes Claesz, many of the Frisians were willing to unite, but they were counteracted by the leaders.[100] May I add that if one wants to find really "fundamentalist" Mennonites in Dutch history, he should make the acquaintance of the Frisians, but I must also say that the Frisians wanted to maintain a different foundation than that of the original Mennonites. Menno himself did not desire any other foundation than that which had already been laid, Jesus Christ, but the harsh Frisians only recognized the foundation laid in Twisck's interpretation of Menno's writing.

In the meantime a unification had taken place between two Flemish branches, both of which had put much value on the written

[99] *Antwoord op sekere dry vragen, dienende tot opmerckinge voor de eens geloofsgesinde ende nochtans verscheyden vergaderingen* (Amsterdam, 1628) 3.

[100] Kühler, 1600-1735, 191 f.

Word, and who were but slightly receptive to mysticism. In many respects one of them may be said to be close to the Twisck group. On April 21, 1632, the larger part of the Flemish Mennonites of the southern sections of Holland made peace on the basis of the Dordrecht Confession of Faith, written by Adriaan Cornelis. This Confession stated that the true church is recognizable by its Scriptural faith, doctrine, love, and godly behavior, also by its observance of the true ordinances of Christ which He has strictly enjoined on His followers.[101]

That such Flemish groups did not approve of the *Olive Branch* is obvious. The *Olive Branch* had more success among the moderate Frisians, who had already united with the High German branch. The confession of faith of these High Germans, by Jan Cents, was found to be in harmony with the *Olive Branch,* and in 1636 these two groups united at Amsterdam. The next step was the union of this united denomination with the Flemish. It must have been a joyful day, April 26, 1639, when Flemish and Frisians and High Germans constituted a united Mennonite brotherhood. [102]

But unfortunately this unification gave rise to a new schism, which was caused by the conflict between confessionalism and mysticism. In this fierce battle the spiritualistic movement conquered and consequently there came an opportunity to unite with the Waterlander branch.

Everything seemed beautiful and everyone peace-minded at the union of 1639. Weeping with joy, the moderate Frisians, the High Germans, the Old and Young Flemish had united. But this did not mean that Tieleman Tielen van Sittert, who in the name of the Frisians had accepted the union, was satisfied in every respect. The *Olive Branch* had been the medium of union, though he himself preferred the Jan Cents confession of faith. Nevertheless he was convinced—perhaps rashly—that the *Olive Branch* was ample guarantee for a pure church of strict Mennonites. [103]

Seven years afterwards it would appear that van Sittert had been mistaken. And here Galenus Abrahamsz de Hahn enters the scene. In 1646 Galenus set up as a doctor at Amsterdam. He was born at Zierikzee, and joined the United Flemish, who assembled in the church next to a brewery called the Lamb.[104] We shall call

[101] *Voorstellinge van de principale articulen onses algemeynen Christelijken geloofs, gelijck deselve in onse Gemeynte doorgaens geleert en beleeft worden* (Dordrecht Confession, art. VIII) in *De Algemeene Belijdenissen,* etc. (Rotterdam, 1739) 84.

[102] W. J. Kühler, *Geschiedenis van de Doopsgezinden in Nederland, 1650-1735,* 197-99,

[103] *Ibid.,* 198 f.

[104] *Lijkreden ter gedachtenis van Galenus Abrahamsz door Wilhem van Maurik,* in *Eenige nagelaten geschriften van Galenus Abrahamsz* (Amsterdam, 1707) 15.

this the congregation of Lamb, just as was done in those days. Why did Galenus not join the Waterlander congregation? His spiritual attitude would have made it easier for him to dwell among them rather than among the Flemish. He appears to have been a spiritual mystic even more than had been the composers of the *Olive Branch.* He may have had three reasons for joining the congregation of the Lamb. In the first place he came from a Flemish community, and the meetinghouse had originally been used by the Flemish. In the second place he must have had great expectations of the recent peace. In the third place he may have considered the Waterlanders to be too loose in their behavior. He had met the latter only incidentally, but the Waterlanders once had the repute of looseness. We remember the term "Dung Cart" used by Lenaert Bouwens.

Galenus married the daughter of the late Abraham Dircks Bierens, who had been one of the composers of the *Olive Branch.* With two of the others he was acquainted, having met them when they came to Leyden to celebrate the communion service. Galenus had studied at the famous university there. At the moment Galenus settled at Amsterdam, the congregation of the Lamb had two vacancies in the ministry. Joost Hendriks, the fourth composer and author of the preface of the *Olive Branch,* had passed away at the same time as Galenus' father-in-law. Probably Galenus was chosen to replace Abraham Bierens, and his friend David Spruyt to replace Joost Hendriks. [105]

In those days it was customary for the new ministers to make a personal confession of faith. The elders, admonishers, and deacons examined the confession, and—if they were satisfied—they approved of the choice of the congregation (the preachers were chosen by a meeting of members). Now, when Galenus read his confession of faith, Tieleman Tielen van Sittert raised objections, asking for a more definite statement on the Holy Spirit; Galenus answered that he agreed with the *Olive Branch.* (Though the *Olive Branch* does not speak clearly about this doctrine, it is included.) Consequently Tieleman Tielen said he was satisfied.[106]

Besides it was not a possible heresy in respect to this doctrine that caused the difficulties, as has been assumed, and has been stated in several studies.[107] Galenus never failed to baptize in the name

[105] *Lijkreden,* 15 f.

[106] *Commonitio ofte waarschouwinge aen de Vlaemsche Doopsgesinde Gemeynte binnen Amsterdam* (Amsterdam, 1655) 4.

[107] J. C. van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (Haarlem, 1895) 140-45; K. O. Meinsma, *Spinoza en zijn kring* ('sGravenhage, 1896), 97-101; C. B. Hylkema, *Reformateurs,* II (Haarlem, 1902) 171 f.; W. J. Kühler, *Het Socinianisme in Nederland,* 155-58.

of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and though he had his particular idea of the Holy Trinity,[108] this idea did not necessarily give rise to trouble. Incidentally, Tieleman Tielen was right in asking for a clearer statement on this subject; he himself held the Calvinistic view, and Galenus did not. But a more serious matter was the question whether one was saved by submission to the church or by one's personal faith. This problem was spoken about at the moment when the Waterlanders sent an offer of peace. The united congregation had received this offer before Galenus became minister, but postponed the answer. The Waterlanders had added the confession of Hans de Ries, that the Flemish might know their faith; but they stated that they themselves preferred to keep all human writings (note the two words) in a chest, in order to accept only God's Word in the Bible (note that "in") as the rule and test of their faith and behavior.[109] That statement should have warned the United Flemish, but in their answer they did not refer to it. The answer written by Galenus, probably because he was the one of the two younger preachers who were best able to formulate, said only that the united brethren feared too much looseness in church polity. The Waterlanders had accepted members of non-Mennonite churches, who had not been baptized as adults, without rebaptizing them. This point is one of the severest objections they made, and in reality they seemed to state that the Waterlanders regarded all other Christian churches as churches of Christ.[110] That was too much for the Flemish, or better, for the Frisians. The Waterlanders appeared to think that whoever had confessed his faith in any church, would be at one with God; this the Flemish could not agree to.

I said that Galenus wrote the answer. He has often been reproached with this fact, not by the Waterlanders, but by his fellow Mennonites.[111] The fact that afterwards his views in respect to his spiritualism appeared to be Waterland seemed opposite to what he had signed in 1649. They accused him of "frivolity."[112]

Galenus was probably frightened by the discussion of the Waterland presentation, and he must have asked himself if his congre-

[108] *Verdediging der Christenen die Doopsgesinde genaamd worden* (Amsterdam, 1699) 149.

[109] *Waterlandtsche Gemeyntes Vredespresentatie* (n.p., Amsterdam, 1648) 5.

[110] *Antwoord van de Vereenighde Vlaamsche, Duytsche en Vriesche Gemeenten op den Vreden-voorstel bij de Waterlandtsche Gemeynte aen haer gedaen* (Amsterdam, 1649) 11.

[111] *Ooghwater voor de Vlaamsche Doopsgezinde Gemeynte* (Amsterdam n.d., 1664) 8.

[112] *Antwoort van de Dienaren der Vereenighde Vlaamsche, Hoogduytsche en Vriesche Doopsgezinde Gemeynte* (Amsterdam, n.d., 1664) 15-18.

gation had any right to judge another Christian church so harshly. At that time he made the acquaintance of the Collegiants.[113] The convictions of this remarkable group are too noteworthy to pass over in silence. In general these people held that the Christian Church had fallen into decay since Emperor Constantine had released it from persecution. From that time the worldly methods and organization had penetrated it, and made it quite worldly. Its spiritualistic character decreased during the centuries, and even the Reformation had not succeeded in restoring the ancient splendor.[114] This train of thought we find already among the Anabaptist martyrs. Hans Keescooper expressed this idea in the same words: "For 1300 years [that was exactly the time elapsed since Constantine] the church has been depraved."[115]

Jan Geertsz also knew that the church has been depraved for centuries. [116] But the Mennonites hoped to have the former church restored.[117] Note the expression of Dirk Philips' *Restitution.* And —unpleasant though it may be—in Münster too the Anabaptists brought the restitution again and again to the fore.[118] The Collegiants, however, thought that one must not attempt to restore the church by human resources. They stated that the Holy Spirit would establish the true church at His own time. (This was also said by Menno Simons as opposed to Jan van Leiden.)[119] In the meantime the faithful had to wait.

The Collegiants avoided the existing churches, convinced that these churches were mere human patchwork, but Galenus remained loyal to his brotherhood, hoping for an opportunity to lead it in the direction of a church which would not be rejected by Christ when He returned. I think these thoughts are truly Mennonite.

This idea, noted in the Waterland presentation, we find also among the Collegiants: the Scriptures only are to be the Confession of Faith. And one must not try to make a summary of it; such a concept would be too dependent on the subjective idea of the author. Moreover the right interpretation of certain texts had better not be discussed. Everyone ought to have liberty to understand them as the Holy Spirit permitted him to understand them.[120] That was the spiritualistic tendency. And finally the Collegiants refused to make a difference between groups of Christians. They interpreted the words, "One is your Master and you are all brethren,"

[113] *Lijkreden,* 16.
[114] van Slee, *op. cit.,* 268 f.
[115] *Offer des Heeren,* 122.
[116] *Ibid.,* 397.
[117] *Ibid.,* 293, 326, 327, 397, 438, 455, 456, 639.
[118] Kühler, *Zestiende eeuw,* 78, 79, 126, 127.
[119] Menno, *Opera,* 626a; b.
[120] Rues, *op. cit.,* 304–407.

in the sense that nobody had an exclusive right to celebrate the church functions of baptism and communion. Closely connected with this idea is the conviction that baptism means incorporation into the general Christian church, and not into a visible church. Therefore the communion services must be open to everyone who seeks Christ from the depth of his heart, and not only to the members of a certain group. [121] This was a much more extreme conviction than most of the Mennonites had, but it must be admitted that it was its logical consequence of the prior idea.

In 1655 the Collegiants, needing a meetinghouse, asked the church wardens of the Lamb to be allowed to meet there.[122] This request was of course supported by Galenus. It was to be expected that the wardens would refuse. But the discussion of the request led to argument on the condition of the church of Christ on earth. Galenus and Spruyt felt themselves obliged to explain their ideas in a treatise,[123] the *XIX Articles* of 1657; in these theses spiritualism was more systematically established than anywhere else in the whole of Mennonite history.

The New Testament recognizes only one church, the two minister stated, who though they were the youngest of the board had both reached the age of discretion. The excellence of the apostolic church appears by the frequent manifestation of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Even those Christians who were not officially ordained to the ministry received the Holy Spirit. All this unfortunately soon had disappeared. None of the existing churches may pride themselves on being founded by the definite command of Christ Himself. They were all the work of man. The Mennonite churches too need the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Moreover they are divided. They cannot be true apostolic churches, for if they were, they should possess the attitude of being peaceful and inspired by divine zeal. They are established only by "a mere entrusting and an as yet unproved hope that God will look kindly down at them." Their ministry and their ceremonies are no more equal to those of the New Testament. Consequently one is not allowed to bind the conscience of others to them.[124]

It is easily understandable that these revolutionary theses caused a hurricane of indignation. Everything dear and holy to the

[121] van Slee, *op. cit.*, 271.

[122] *Lammerenkrijgh anders Mennonisten Kerckentwist, Waerschouw* (n.p., Amsterdam, 1663) Clv.

[123] *Nader verklaringe van de XIX artikelen* (Amsterdam, 1659) 3 f.

[124] *Bedenckingen over den toestant der sichtbare kercke Christi op aarden* in *Nader verklaringe, passim.*

Flemish and Frisians had been doubted and questioned: the church, the doctrine, the ordination, and the sacraments. The ministers were afraid that the days of Jan van Leyden and David Jorisz would return.[125] They hated and despised spiritualism from the moment it appeared in this form. For two days they discussed and argued, and finally an answer was written by Laurens Hendriks, one of the deacons, in order to move Galenus to resign.[126] Galenus did not resign. And it became clear that he had caused an echo in the congregation. Indeed, many Mennonites throughout the Low Countries agreed with his convictions. Then the board of ministers tried in another way to compel Galenus to surrender his ministry. They called a large conference of the United Flemish, Frisian, and High German congregations at Leyden. Tieleman Jans van Braght presided. This meeting stated that the convictions of Galenus and Spruyt were heresies. This conference or "synod," as it was called in the very year in which it was held, 1660, delegated four men to compel Galenus and Spruyt to resign.[127]

Galenus and Spruyt did not obey. Only the brotherhood which had chosen them had the right to request them to resign, not the accidental meeting of elders. The opponents of the two spiritualists requested some elders of other communities to help them. This method was sometimes used to make peace. But in this case it was impossible because the congregation of the Lamb wished no interference of elders from other communities. Galenus' friends thought it necessary, in view of the menacing dispute, to call on the city magistrates to avoid confusion. On January 31, 1662, the two parties made a pact of tolerance, which stated that they should accept each other just as they believed, behaved, and felt at that moment. The proclamation of the pact was hailed with loud cheers; the congregation of the Lamb was tired of quarreling.[128]

Nevertheless by the proclamation of the pact, the "War among the Lambs," as the quarrel was mockingly called, did not cease. But let us only mention in brief what happened next. The opponents among the ministers succeeded in getting the privilege of choosing ministers in the next vacancies. They ordained two fighters, Izaak van Vreeden and Samuel Apostool.[129] Apostool, then a youth of twenty-four, caused the last schism in Dutch Men-

125 D. O. S., *Sociniaensche Hooftpijn* (n.p., n.d.) 3.

126 Laurens Hendricksz, *Antwoorde bij forme van aenmerckingen, vragen ende redenen* (Amsterdam, 1658).

127 *Verhaal van Leyden,* 13 f.

128 *Accoord van vrede en verdraagsaamheyd,* Archives of the Vereenigde Doopsgezinde Gemeente te Amsterdam, No. B 1249.

129 L. Bidloo, *Menno's Kerck in en uyt Babel* (Amsterdam, 1665) 19-21.

nonitism. Izaak van Vreeden was to cause another afterwards, of little importance for history, but one that ought to make his followers ashamed.[130]

In the morning service of October 15, 1662, Apostool preached against the convictions of van Lookeren, one of the friends of Galenus, though he should have known that by the pact of tolerance of January the ministers were obliged to respect each other's ideas.[131] Apostool, reproached for having done this, stated that the pact of tolerance was proclaimed and accepted before he was ordained and that he, consequently, could not be expected to accept heresies such as van Lookeren had permitted himself. By this answer Galenus felt compelled to preach against the sermon of Apostool on that same Sunday evening.[132] After these two sermons Calvinists, Lutherans, and even Catholics attended the services, to hear the progress of the dispute. They were not disappointed. Three times Galenus and Apostool insulted each other in the pulpit. There was much excitement in Amsterdam. The Burgomasters ordered the oral dispute in the pulpit to cease, and it ceased.[133]

But it was not the difference between Apostool's somewhat Calvinistic ideas and Galenus' spiritualistic convictions that had caused the altercation. Nor was it the discrepancy between Apostool's emphasis on satisfaction through the death of Christ, nor Galenus' supposed perfectionism (for Galenus did not entrust himself to the merits of perfect behavior; on the contrary he believed he was saved by grace). Rather it was Galenus' request for freedom to formulate one's own and particular faith. He did not like the confessions at all though he agreed with the *Olive Branch,* and thought he could have signed the Jan Cents confession. But he opposed the tendency of the other ministers to bind the conscience to it.[134]

This was too much for the confessionalistic preachers. The unification had taken place on the basis of the two formulae and

[130] He left the congregation which was called "de Zon" and founded the church called the "Kleine Zon," which existed until 1679: *Daghtekeningh van de Son-eclips* (n.p., Amsterdam, 1670) 5-56.

[131] The contemporaries give different testimonies about the date of the dispute. Some sources state that the lamentable fact happened October 15, others November 15. Even the year seems to be uncertain: 1662 or 1663, but reconstructing the calendar of the two years one discovers that the tumultuous Sunday must have been October 15, 1662.

[132] *Reductie van de zogenaamde Deductie ofte Zedige overweginge* (Amsterdam, 1663) 23 f.

[133] Ooghwater, 10; *Boerepraetje* (Amsterdam, 1664) 5.

[134] G. A. en D. S. (Galenus and Spruyt) *Wederleggingh van Laurens Hendrickss* (Amsterdam, 1659) 100 f.

therefore they felt obliged to maintain the authority of the confessions. Everyone—though he might be a man of Galenus' intelligence—who opposed this statement had to resign, and when he did not so of his own free will, they were inclined to force him.

Consequently Laurens Hendriks decided to call in the highest magistracy in the Low Countries, viz., the Court of Holland at The Hague. His aim was to get Galenus banished from the country. On September 14, 1663, Galenus was summoned to justify himself before the Court. The charge was that he was a Socinian, and Socinianism was the only heresy the government would not tolerate.[135]

It is possible that Galenus' convictions had a Socinian tendency, although this is not certain. But if this is the case, Galenus did not believe otherwise than many martyrs did.[136] Jooskint and Claesken had emphasized that Christ had died to demonstrate the truth of His doctrine.[137] That was a typical Socinian conviction, and it is the only one we can observe in Galenus' faith. It was called a heresy, because the Calvinistic ministers—the dominating clergy at that time—had convinced the government, that this idea underestimated the merits of Christ. By His crucifixion He had completely expiated the sins of mankind to God. Whoever omitted this dogma of expiation was called a dangerous heretic.[138] The only way to get rid of Galenus therefore was to have him condemned by the Court of Holland. But the Court acquitted him of Socinianism and on the contrary stated that he was a genuine Mennonite.[139]

After this calamity there was no way out for the confessionalists but separation. Izaak van Vreeden and Samuel Apostool left the "Lamb" together with a quarter of the congregation, some 500 supporters.[140] They founded the church called the Sun, named for the characteristic stone tablet in the wall of the building. This happened in the last days of May 1664. From that time the Sunnists accepted the three "general" confessions: the *Olive Branch,* the Jan Cents Confession, and the Dordrecht Confession.

135 *Samenspraak tusschen Klaas Koopman en Dirk Timmerman, voorgevallen op de Admiraliteytswerf tot Amsterdam* (n.p., n.d.) A4 and v.

136 This fact he stated in a discussion with Jan Evertsz; *Winckelpraetjen* (n.p., Amsterdam, 1655) 16.

137 *Offer des Heeren, 222, 327.*

138 Kühler: *Socinianisme,* 169 f.

139 *Copia van de uytspraek bij den Ed. Hove van Hollandt gedaen in de saeck van Gal. Abrahamsz,* Archives of the municipality at Amsterdam, printed in P. Balling, *Verdediging van de regering der Doopsgezinde Gemeente* (Amsterdam, 1663) 59 f.

140 Minute book of the congregation called the Zon, Archives of the Vereenigde Doopsgezinden Gemeente Amsterdam No. B 873, fol. 8.

After the separation the confessional groups were absorbed in the Sunnist party. The Sunnists founded a Society of Mennonite congregations in 1674 on the basis of no fewer than five confessions of faith.[141]

The more spiritualistically minded Mennonites joined the Lamist congregation to form a larger fellowship, the Lamist Society. The first were the Waterlanders, who united as early as four years after the schism, 1668, with the United Flemish, Frisians, and High Germans.[142] And at the turn of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, there were no longer a Waterland, and two Old Flemish groups, a Young Flemish group and four Frisian groups; there were only two large brotherhoods and a very few small Mennonite groups like the Jan Jacobsgezinden, the Danziger Old Flemish, and the Harsh Frisians. The "War of the Lambs" had cleansed the Mennonite sky. Of the Harsh Frisians at Balk a number of families emigrated to the United States in 1853.[143] The two large brotherhoods (Lamist and Sunnist) existed until 1801. In that year the last congregation of confessionalists joined the non-conformistic Society. It was the original Sun congregation, which united with the original Lamb congregation at Amsterdam.[144] From that moment there was only one Mennonite Church in Holland, the congregations of which have been organized in the "Algemene Doopsgezinde Sociëteit" (General Mennonite Society) since 1811.

It is remarkable that one of the most strictly confessional groups, the Groningen Old Flemish, stated in 1755: "More attention should be paid to the pious disposition of mind, in which the true membership of the congregation consists, than in a concise agreement in dogma."[145]

It can be said that the main matter in religion had become trusting in God. There must be freedom in all lesser things which are adventitious compared with this trusting. Therefore the toleration of the Dutch Mennonites is not only forbearance, but thankfulness that there are many varieties in religious experience. The Holy Spirit determines our answer to the calling by God. The Dutch Mennonites can never again be a confessional church that

141 *Grondtsteen van vreede en verdraegsaemheyt* (Amsterdam, 1674) 12.

142 Archives of the Vereenigde Doopsgezinde Gemeente No. B 1392.

143 S. Blaupot ten Cate, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht en Gelderland* I (Amsterdam, 1847) 356.

144 S. Cramer, *De vereeniging der twee Amsterdamsche Gemeenten in 1801,* in *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen* (Leiden, 1898) 7-33.

145 *Geloofsbelijdenisse der Doopsgezinden bekent onder de naam van Oude Vlamingen* (Groningen, 1755) a 2v, a 3r.

requires agreement with human statements. This spiritualistic mysticism seems to be an essential characteristic. Dutch Mennonitism has Galenus to thank for it. It seems a paradox that Galenus, whose convictions gave rise to the last great schism among the Dutch Mennonites, properly speaking longed for the unification of the divisions into which the brotherhood had fallen apart. Yet this very longing may be read in all his books. In the background of his convictions we find the influence of the booklet written by the Brethren at Zierikzee. They could not understand anything else but that the confusion of the quarreling between the Flemish and the Frisians was a just punishing rod in the Lord's hands, in order that the Mennonites might remember the state from which they had fallen, and that they should be renewed to the former fervor of love to God.[146] Galenus asked himself by what means the unification could be realized. He gave a remarkable answer. In the first place the absolute essentials of salvation have to be made clear. That could be nothing but faith working by love. When that faith should be restored, the unification would be a fact, for the quarreling had always been about mere secondary articles. It is the tragedy of all the quibbling of the different parties that people who were at one in real fundamental matters wrangled about things not essential for salvation. It seems impossible for the fighters to observe this fact in the heat of the struggle. It is Galenus' merit, indeed his unique significance for Dutch Mennonitism, that he decided: "To keep the unity within the Christian Church, one should consider the difference between the necessary and the useful truths. One has to fix the few things that are absolutely clear, and to put up with the other things by love." So he says in the eighth of his *Short Basic Principles of the Mennonites*.[147] He thinks that all those people are Christians who keep the Scriptures as their only standard for faith and behavior, confess that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, who deny themselves, bear the cross, and follow Him faithfully.[148] No human being should interpret Christ's commandments; the only real and reliable interpretation of Christ's doctrine was "to use the holy and immaculate life of Jesus Himself."[149] Therefore the religious individuality is of the highest importance. The church occupies the second place.

146 *Christelijcke Proeve,* 4.

147 *Verdediging der Doopsgezinden,* 143-45, together with *Korte Grondstellingen* VIII, 8.

148 *Anleyding tot de kennis van de Christelijke Godsdienst* (Amsterdam, 1693) 34.

149 *Korte Grondstellingen* VI, 6.

The reason for this underestimating of the church (if called by that name) was, that Galenus, and several Mennonites with him, had noticed that the members of the churches had left off seeking communion with the Lord; they easily satisfied themselves with the outward ceremonies, in which He was thought to be present, but seldom experienced Him as truly existing. Love had become cold, therefore the gifts of the Holy Spirit had disappeared. The churches had fixed the creed, but had forgotten the faith that should inspire the entire life of the Christians. In this way the churches, even the Mennonite congregations, had fallen from their former splendor. This backsliding had been foretold by Christ Himself and was inevitable since He had not given any orders to restore His church; the Mennonites must not think that their churches were more than institutions brought about by well-meaning men.[150] It did not matter that the Flemish church near the Lamb responded to the seven standards mentioned by Menno Simons for the true Christian Church. This was a merely human judgment. The only judgment on which Galenus desired to put value was the judgment of the living Christ.

He believed that Christ only judged His personal followers and not their earthly organization. Therefore he did not seek the glory of his own congregation, but the honor of his heavenly Master. He loved his church, because it was—so he considered—in accord with what Christ had shown them.[151] As long as God did not destroy the Mennonite Church as a useless instrument, the Mennonites had to do their best to improve it. In order to do that, Galenus tried to stimulate individual faith. In his prayers he seemed, as his biographer said, to cling to his God,[152] and poured out his devotion for the Lord which he called "being in holy love with Him."[153]

In consequence of this, Galenus criticized the institution of elders and ministers and deacons. He did not despise the individuals—he never did—but he disliked the institution. In the apostolic church the servants helped to build a brotherhood that could be the body of Christ. Therefore the Lord had equipped them with the gifts of the Holy Spirit, such as wisdom, power to ordain others as bishops and wardens, and to transfer to the people the blessings by prayer and imposition of hands. In consequence of this they were

150 *Bedenkingen,* Art. XVI; *Korte Grondstellingen* LXI-LXIV, 47-51.
151 *Wederlegginge,* 55.
152 *Lijkreden,* 20.
153 *Anleyding,* 114.

rightly considered as sent by the Lord Himself. But how far from all this were the ministers of his time! They did not preach the Lord's Word as the apostles had done. They could not be designated as ordained by Christ Himself. Yea, there was reason to doubt if they might be considered called by the Lord by means of the congregation. Almost every leader of the Mennonites had remained below the standards of the New Testament.[154]

One fact in particular made him state this—the moral restraint they exercised. In his answer to Laurens Hendriks he exclaims: "May the Lord, who has the hearts of men in His hands, have mercy upon us, that the innocent sheep, who mostly cling to their leaders by mere lack of discrimination, never will be shipwrecked in their faith and love because of the actions of their so-called pastors."[155] His most serious problem was that the members of the church had been made absolutely dependent on their leaders, in accordance with the formulation of their faith and the management of the congregation. The original rights of the Mennonite members to influence the choice of ministers had been curtailed by the actions of the elders.

In the apostolic church the members were gifted to the extent of their faith; one can say that the officials as well as the regular members were baptized by one Spirit into one body. The functions have not to be performed on the grounds of a special privilege, but on the grounds of a general calling and duty to mutual love.[156] In a living church wishing to be designated as a true Christian church every one has been made a king and a priest by Christ. The distinction between officials and laymen must be done away with.

The consequences of these convictions are shown by Galenus' conception of the sacraments. Galenus felt hindered in putting the same value on baptism and the Lord's Supper as was put on them in the first church. These ceremonies were certainly commanded by the Lord Himself, but their consecration had been defiled.

As for baptism, among Galenus' contemporaries baptism was considered as Biblical only when it was performed in their particular group. I have mentioned the custom of rebaptism, when a Waterland Mennonite wished to join the Flemish congregation. Galenus did not approve of that action. There was one Lord, one Spirit, one baptism. And from that he concluded that the person to be baptized must not go to the baptismal water, driven by the old hum-

154 *Wederlegginge*, 69-76.
155 *Ibid.*, 86.
156 *Ibid.*, 90.

drum way, custom, practice of imitation of others, but by the power of conviction, respecting the first institution by the Lord in order to obey the Lord's commandment. By these means baptism was a characterizing and public proof of the acceptance of the Christian religion. Baptism for Galenus was the token of the alliance with God and Christ, but it was not a condition of the belonging to Christ. This belonging depends on the confession of faith, which is—of course—the confession of the heart. Baptism was not the sacramental "washing of regeneration." From the sixth chapter of Romans Galenus could not read anything else than that anyone who wanted to be baptized had to lay off his sins before he should undergo the ceremony.[157] We remember the word of the martyr Elisabeth: "All the water of the ocean cannot save me; Christ only gives salvation."[158] In this way baptism was auxiliary, but not necessary for salvation.

Galenus did not intend to give up the baptismal ceremony, because it was instituted by the Lord. But no conscience should be bound to the sacrament and one should not despise others who do not wish to undergo the ceremony. One should only act as nearly as possible in accord with the usages of the New Testament. Carefully practiced, the ceremony can have some utility. Baptism by the Holy Spirit and fire is the aim of baptism by water. And he had observed that many Mennonites, though grown up, had in reality been baptized like children, because they had no discernment. Therefore the mortification of the flesh, the crucifying of the body and the burial of the members could not be observed. Therefore baptism missed the significance Christ had given to it.[159]

Galenus' convictions about the communion services were the same. The breaking of the bread (typical Mennonite expression) was not so much a church ceremony as a house ceremony. Jesus Christ maintained the Jewish usage of eating the Passover, but He changed the aim. Since the Last Supper at Jerusalem the communion service was to be kept in remembrance of Him. In consequence not only a congregation can perform the communion service, but also a pious family. Galenus observed that too much value was put on the ceremony in the church. Many believed in it as in a principle of their religion, thinking they were thereby doing a deserving work when they observed it two or four times a year. But they do not trouble about the really necessary things of the faith. Bread and

[157] *Ibid.*, 102 f.; *Anleyding*, 49.
[158] *Offer des Heeren*, 93.
[159] *Wederlegginge*, 105.

wine were very common things. When Jesus was wandering in Galilee, they were present in every house. The Master chose such ordinary things as tokens of His love. And His love is the only important thing. The breaking of the bread is the proof of obedience to the commandment to commemorate His love, which revealed itself in the most glorious way at the cross. So it is not permissible to keep out anyone who wants to participate in the service in remembrance of Jesus, not even when he differs from the congregation in the unessential truths. Nobody has the right to consider himself more worthy to participate than another. There is no statement in the Scriptures to justify such a privilege.[160] The only thing everyone must do before making up his mind to share in the communion service is to examine his own conscience. Galenus designates this as the self-examination (*eigen-proef*). Neither the church nor the eldership of a congregation has the right to judge who is allowed to participate. Christ only is the master of consciences. The Christian has to examine himself upon three points: in the first place whether he is blameless in morals and living, in the second place whether he wants to participate in simplicity and joy of heart, in the third place whether he is willing to commemorate the inexpressible love of God and the crucifixion of His Son, to believe in the evidence of forgiveness of sins, which is the crucifixion, and to show his gratefulness by a holy attitude.[161]

This self-examination gave occasion for slander. "Galenus could have permitted a Jew or a Roman Catholic to attend the ceremony, if they declared they were joining them on their own responsibility"; in this way the opponents interpreted self-examination.[162] Galenus' tolerance, which allowed him to admit everyone to the service who desired to commemorate Christ, made Lambert Bidloo write 200 pages on the subject: *Unlimited Tolerance Is the Destruction of the Mennonite Congregations.* This book, written in 1701, was reprinted in 1742.[163] Nowadays, after two centuries, we may say that Galenus' tolerance was limited by the requirement for a real and honest longing to follow Christ as His disciple and that this limited tolerance—of course—should be the end of the identification of the Flemish group with the true church of God.

But all these convictions inevitably led to disapproval of the confessions of faith. During the second quarter of the seventeenth

160 *Ibid.*, 107 f.

161 *Anleyding*, 50-57.

162 L. Bidloo, *Onbepaalde verdraagzaamheid de verwoesting der Doopsgezinden* (Amsterdam, 1742) 41 f.

163 *Ibid.*, title page.

century the Mennonites seemed to have forgotten the aim for which these confessions were composed. And the elders required of the members of their congregations that they should interpret the Scriptures according to the confession. That means that a strong Calvinistic influence came into the Mennonite faith. In this way they had deviated from the original conviction expressed by many martyrs, that their belief was not founded upon Augustine, Luther, Zwingli, or even upon Menno, though they were convinced that there was but little difference between the faith of Menno and their own faith.[164] So Galenus stated that the "General Confessions" (as they were designated since the Leyden synod of Flemish delegates) originated only in the better understanding of their authors. Nobody could prove that the Lord approved of them in the form in which they were formulated.[165] The religion of the New Testament should not be literalism, but it had to be fulfilled in the power of the Holy Spirit. The martyrs had died on behalf of that living faith, on behalf of the commandments of their Master, which they had felt in their conscience, but not on behalf of the plainly expressed order of the letter of the New Testament. They had given their lives for salvation, experienced by the working of the living God, but not for adequate formulae of the mysteries of God's being.[166]

How faith should be expressed was for Galenus a matter of no importance. He did not object to confessions written in order that others might learn on what foundation their creed was founded, but he objected to binding consciences to matters which did not touch the Christian religion at its heart.

But the question for us is, What arguments did the Flemish elders have for holding the words of the confessions of faith as adequate? I think the answer is simple: because the Mennonite leaders were not scholars. At the price of much effort they had composed the creedal formulae. They thought they had reason to be satisfied. The formulae were of course different from the Calvinistic catechism, but they were Scriptural as well. During the colloquia (debates with the Calvinists) their predecessors were forced to capitulate before the scholarship of the Reformed leaders. Now at last they had statements approved by the High Court of Holland.[167] Galenus' opposition gave them the impression that they had to begin all over again.

[164] *Offer des Heeren*, 301.
[165] *Wederlegginge*, 100 f.
[166] *Ibid.*, 54.
[167] *Samenspraak Koopman-Timmerman*, A3.

For many of them it was too heavy a burden to live alone by the conception of the Holy Spirit. Such a foundation was too inaccessible to teach in the Bible classes and could not be supervised by hearing the individual confessions of faith. And there was—I must mention this again and again—the danger of exaltation in the sense of Jan van Leyden and David Jorisz. The Calvinists always reproached them with being descendants of the Münsterites.[168] Therefore they shrank back from self-revelation of the Holy Spirit to the spirit of mankind. Galenus had an open eye for this danger. The Holy Scriptures, he says, are the measure by which the experienced revelations must be measured. Asked for the standard by which the words of the Bible could be measured (the Mennonites disapproved, for instance, of some of the Psalms; they refused to sing them in their congregational services because of the hatred and the violence that are to be found in them),[169] he replied that the standard for the words of the Bible was Christ. In consequence only Christ was the standard for the truth of the inspiration by the Holy Spirit.[170]

These convictions he composed into a system after the War of Lambs was over. In 1677 he wrote an *Introduction to the Knowledge of the Christian Belief*,[171] followed in 1682 by a *Short Summary*;[172] at the end of his life he composed it most clearly in his *Short Basic Principles of the Christian Doctrine of the Mennonites* (1799).[173] It is not necessary to give an exposé of this system (we have spoken about all the essentials except one), but a general view will set forth its logical coherence. Then it will be clearer also what is its heart.

Galenus begins with the Bible. The Scriptures are the standard of faith and moral attitude, but they have to be interpreted according to the figure of Christ. At the same time the human understanding, enlightened by the Lord, reveals the true meaning. The New Testament is of greater value than the Old (this thesis is genuinely Mennonite; almost all the martyrs state this).[174] A knowledge of the New Testament is necessary for being saved. Mankind longs for salvation, and therefore all people have to read the Bible.[175]

168 For instance, H. Moded, *Grondich Bericht van de eerste beghinselen der Wederdoopsche seckten* (Middelburg, 1603) 53-55.

169 Claes Claes, *op. cit.*, 384-88.

170 *Korte Grondstellingen*, 5 f.

171 *Anleyding*, etc. (Amsterdam, 1677).

172 *Kort Begrijp van de Anleyding*, etc. (Amsterdam, 1682).

173 *Korte Grondstellingen van de Christelijke Leer der Doopsgesinden.*

174 For instance, *Offer des Heeren*, 245, 303, 327, 431.

175 *Korte Grondstellingen*, 7 f.

But they have to read critically. The Scriptures are a collection of words spoken by God and of testimonies about Him, rather than the only Word of the Lord. So one is allowed to make a choice according to the standard given in the pure and immaculate life of Christ. They have actually to be read in the original languages in order that one can understand what the words really mean. Galenus noticed several differences in the text of the first three Gospels, for instance, in the Lord's Prayer.[176]

The Bible can give us a formula of God's being. The principal matter is naturally the experience of His grace, but the knowledge of God's attributes is very useful. A few examples only: "What is the use of having knowledge of God's goodness? Answer: not only that we are instigated to love Him in return, but it gives us consolation to know that He is a loving Father." In the same way the knowledge of God's omniscience is very useful for us, in order to act under all circumstances as if we were before His all-seeing eye, and—this must not be omitted—as if we were always in His presence, as we in reality are! In the same way the knowledge of all the other attributes serves to strengthen our faith in Him, and to remind us of our religious duties.[177]

Galenus writes many things about the demands and the promises of the Lord. And though belief in the promises and obedience to the demands is a matter of the trusting of the heart, nevertheless this faith is not an unassured hope and simple confidence, as Galenus stated about the churches;[178] this is truth because Christ has established it. This last sentence gave Galenus' opponents the opportunity to charge him with Socinian heresy. And indeed here is a tendency that justifies the name of Socinian for Galenus. But only here, when he says that Christ died to affirm His doctrine. Galenus wisely did not say a word about the divinity, the humanity, or the God-man-ness of Christ. But his interpretation of the term "Son of God" is clear when he says: "God anointed Him with the Holy Spirit; therefore He was the Saviour of the world. And He saved mankind by giving the proof of the truths which are necessary to salvation."[179] Since the crucifixion mankind has had the certainty and guarantee that His promises are true and His commandments obligatory. "Further it is not necessary to penetrate deeper into the mystery of Christ's existence, neither in the accurate research of His pre-existence, nor in knowledge of His origin in the flesh, union of the two natures, divine and human, etc., because both Christ the

[176] *Anleyding*, 169.
[177] *Ibid.*, 11-23.
[178] *Bedenkingen*, Art. XVI.
[179] *Anleyding*, 29-36.

Lord Himself and His holy messengers have been entirely content with the simple confession that He was the Son of God."[180]

Therefore Galenus' system from here on describes the Christian attitude as dictated in the Sermon on the Mount. The highest aim of this New Law was man's participation in the divine nature. A gradual ascension to that goal is made possible. At the close of his *Address to the Congregation at Zaandam,*[181] which he gave on the occasion of the inauguration of their new church-building in 1687, he issued a little treatise: *The Eight Degrees to Salvation Briefly Assembled,*[182] which is an interpretation of the Beatitudes. A Christian can consider—by the measure of these degrees—how far he has proceeded in the true Christian attitude. Is he still poor in spirit, or does he already mourn for his weakness, is he meek or does he hunger and thirst for righteousness, is he merciful, is he pure in heart and does he long to see God? Then he has to be a peacemaker, but that will entail persecution! A Christian is able, so says the treatise, to participate in the divine nature by much wrestling in prayer and escaping the perdition which is in the world. By that way one learns to practice the Christian virtues and avoid sin.[183]

Galenus' *Ethics* takes no less than 179 large pages of the books he left behind.[184] It is a long-winded and also rather tiring enumeration of the virtues and sins, which he had already described in his former booklets. He divides them into three groups: in the first place virtues and sins toward God and Christ, in the second place those toward one's fellow creatures, in the third place those toward oneself. The proper ethics are temperance and moderation. The ancient Mennonite simplicity does not belie its nature when Galenus in particular speaks of temperance in eating, drinking, clothing, dwelling, furniture, etc. The sins are the opposites of the virtues. Incredulity is opposed to faith, despair to hope, hatred to love, to enumerate no more. Galenus greatly appreciates "patience," which is not only the docile bearing of the cross, but chiefly the avoidance of all vengeance and resistance. The problem connected with this attitude Galenus must have felt in the year in which he began his ministry. At that time the Peace of Westphalia was concluded, which gave independence to the Netherlands. He must have known that freedom of conscience in the Republic was achieved by feat of

180 *Korte Grondstellingen,* 23 f.

181 *Anspraak an de Vereenigde Doopsgezinde Gemeente te Zaandam* (Amsterdam, n.d., 1687).

182 *De VIII trappen ter saligheyd beknoptelijk aneengeschakelt,* 71-86.

183 *Anspraak an Zaandam,* 78.

184 *Eenige nagelaten geschriften van Galenus Abrahamsz* (Amsterdam,1707).

arms. He went through the calamities of 1672, when the independence of the Low Countries was really endangered. The only solution of the problem for Galenus was that one has not to practice "patience" otherwise than as the Lord practiced it Himself and as His messengers interpreted it in their writings. Patience is a commandment. Christ knows things better than the disciples do, and he ought to obey without further investigations.[185] Consistent with the duty of sincerity is the interdiction of oaths, and the duty of obedience or submission to the government. The question whether there are any limitations to this submission, Galenus answered in this way: "A Christian is by no means allowed to refuse obedience to the power placed over him, unless it is apparent from the Word of God, and he himself is convinced in his conscience, that the orders of the magistrates are contrary to the will of God."[186]

And when he again formulates faith, he describes it as a clinging to God, as seeing the invisible. This statement is remarkable, not because it adheres to the pronouncement of God's revelation in Christ, but because its consequence is a holy and chaste being in love with God. By doing so he has avoided the moralism which is obvious and which was so dear to our ancestors. The danger of moralism could be pointed out in his conception of prayer. He says that prayer is commanded so often in the New Testament (also by the example of the Lord Himself), that it is to be called a duty; in fact the offering of one's own will to God. But we know from Galenus' own attitude and from the treatise pertaining to *Rational Experienced Religion*[187] that prayer meant much more to him: "This is the most important reason for recommending prayer to Christendom, that the absent-minded senses are contracted inwardly and that thoughts are elevated to the Almighty, and that the praying person in so doing is able to cling to God, and to unite with Him in a most gracious way." Therefore prayer is the medium given by God to attract God's mercy. God's commandment brings its recompense with it, as he was accustomed to say: "Prayer is a blessing."[188] Besides, the lot that Christ has destined for His disciples is that they should live here on earth in the experience and enjoyment of mercy, and hereafter abide in His presence. That is the essential of faith: "The Lord permits this experienced mercy in severe suffering that must be suffered for His sake." This was the reason why Galenus added

185 *Anleyding*, 81-83.
186 *Ibid.*, 108.
187 *Ibid.*, 162.
188 *Korte verhandeling van de Redelijk-bevindelijke Godsdienst in Eenige nagelaten geschriften*, 7 f.

some extracts from the *Martyrs' Mirror* to his *Introduction* and his *Summary*.[189]

These writings he wanted to inculcate in the Mennonites. And he described this experienced mercy so circumstantially because it is so seldom and usually even incidentally spoken of. Yet Christ's inexpressible riches can be discovered by this gift.[190]

The minister of the United Flemish and Waterland Mennonites, who appreciated ethics so greatly, the zealot for a blameless life, the theologian who only intellectually systematized the Biblical subjects, here shows his real essence, and here reveals the secret of his immense influence upon the people of Menno Simons. The diehards among the leaders had turned the nonessential convictions to essential, had changed the peculiarities into characteristics, and then let their followers forget the true principle.

Galenus brought the principle to light again and he reduced the peculiarities and characteristics to their true proportion. Only the necessary articles of faith mattered. He agreed with the Arminian expression: "Unity in things that are necessary, freedom in those that are uncertain, and love in all things"; but to express his feelings he quoted King James I of England: "For the unification of Christianity there is no shorter way than to separate the necessary things from the unnecessary ones, to take pains in order to be at one in the necessary things, and to give room to Christian freedom for not necessary things."[191]

From the moment the Mennonites would recognize this principle, unity would be restored. For this reason Galenus did not wish to have a confession of faith, and therefore he often emphasized that the convictions he had expressed in his books must neither be considered as a rule of faith to which the consciences should be bound, nor as a confession, which at some time or other could be established in a Mennonite church.

Galenus did not live to see the divided brotherhood united, but he saw that his aims were succeeding. The local mergers which he saw realized—Haarlem 1672, Koog-Zaandijk 1680, Alkmaar 1692, Rotterdam 1700, and Leyden 1701—proved to be in his spirit.[192] And when at the end of the eighteenth century the uniting of all branches was achieved, it was by the statement that "every congregation kept its freedom to make such decisions about doctrine as it wished, but without the right to bind others to their convictions."[193]

189 After *Anleyding*, 239, and after *Kort Begrijp*, 174. 190 *Anleyding*, 197 f.
191 *Verdediging*, 144 f. 192 Blaupot ten Cate, *op. cit.*, 343-56.
193 J. G. de Hoop Scheffer, *De Doopsgezinde Broederschap voor vervloeijing en ondergang bewaard* (Amsterdam, 1861) 46.

It is typical, too, that in founding the *Algemene Doopsgezinde Sociëteit* in 1811, the founders regarded "such a congregation as a Mennonite one, where baptism would only be administered to adults after they had confessed their faith personally."[194]

It was Galenus who put his stamp on Dutch Mennonitism. It was the stamp of the spiritualistic tendency, which has been one of the features of Dutch Mennonitism from the beginning, and Galenus renewed it. Galenus' stamp can be seen in the fact that the Mennonites of today have no other confession of faith than their personal one. They did not choose one of the seven written in the seventeenth century, nor one of the three of the eighteenth century. When the persons to be baptized read their own formulation of their faith, the church officials are allowed to ask only three things: whether they have a firm trust in the living God; whether they recognize Jesus Christ as their Lord; and whether they love their brotherhood.[195]

The Mennonite congregations take their place among the other Dutch churches as congregations of people who want to belong to Christ's own true church, and they believe that the members of the other churches have the same wish. Therefore they do not rebaptize those who come to them from other Christian churches. I suppose it is superfluous to say that Dutch Mennonites have no differences in the ministry. Ever since Galenus' time the preachers all officiate in baptismal and communion services, and their ordination does not take place by a board of elders, but rather—though we do not like to designate it by this word—the young minister is "ordained" by the mere fact that he conducts his first service at the request of a congregation, and is inspired by the Holy Spirit.[196]

I believe this is the main trend of the brotherhood. But spiritualistic Mennonites of Holland are thankful that there is place for a confessional tendency too. They must complement each other. They appreciate each other, knowing that no human being can bind another's conscience, because it is the one God who inspires the varieties of gifts, service, and working, in each one severally. He apportions to every individual as He wills. I Cor. 12:11.

[194] *Reglement voor de Algemeene Doopsgezinde Societeit ter bevordering van den Predikdienst* (Haarlem, 1811) art. 3, 2.

[195] *Minutebook of the Algemene Nederlandse Doopsgezinde Predikanten Vereniging* (Ministers' society) on Sept. 23, 1927; April 13, 1928; Sept. 2, 1935; *Kanselboek ten dienste van de Doopsgezinde Gemeenten in Nederland* (n.p., n.d.) 32.

[196] *Minutebook of the A.N.D.P.V.* on April 25, 1927; April 5, 1937; Sept. 22, 1941; Sept. 9, 1947; Sept. 13, 1948.

THE IMPACT OF CONTEMPORARY MENNONITE EVANGELISTIC OUTREACH ON THE LARGER SOCIETY

John A. Hostetler

Among the basic present-day Mennonite beliefs is the necessity, by divine command, of evangelizing the world. At the beginning Mennonites held the evangelistic imperative central in their belief system, but then lost it, from various causes, chiefly persecution, to recover it largely in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Currently they practice it more or less, depending upon social and situational factors, or their degree of religious reawakening. This report is an excerpt of a larger study of the impact of Mennonite evangelism on non-Mennonite persons in the American environment. The study is limited to the (old) Mennonite Church in the United States and Canada.

The specific problems for investigation are: (1) What success has the Mennonite Church had in assimilating persons of non-Mennonite parentage into its brotherhood? (2) From what population categories does the Mennonite Church draw its out-group members? (3) What are the associational factors which attract outsiders to the group? and (4) What are the dissociational factors which cause persons to become dissatisfied and leave the Mennonite Church?

The underlying assumption is that certain factors attract and repel persons who come in contact with the Mennonite system of values. What are those factors, and how are they related to the known entities of societies—social class, group solidarity, culture change, and assimilation? Stated in another way, the investigation deals with selective mobility, the movement of persons in and out of the Mennonite Church. How much mobility is there? What are the personal characteristics of the religious migrants, both incoming and outgoing? From what social and religious sources do they come and to what do they go? What system of values does the Mennonite Church offer to the out-group person voluntarily joining the group? What kind of contacts have been most fruitful for gaining out-group persons into the Mennonite Church?

Before proceeding, a word should be said about sociological method. There were two groups of people about whom informa-

tion was desired: (1) Out-group converts: present members of the Mennonite Church from outside sources; this includes any person who had no previous affiliation with the Mennonite Church, or any person whose parents were not members of the Mennonite Church, and (2) Ex-members: those who were once, but are no longer members of the Mennonite Church.

Questionnaires were sent to both out-group converts and ex-members. The names and addresses of the two groups were secured from pastors of a 50 per cent random sample of all congregations and missions in the United States and Canada. Only persons who joined or left the church for the ten-year period 1942-51 were included. The sample was stratified by type of church (mission or congregation), by location (rural to urban), and by region (conference district). The questionnaires were pretested on persons from several congregations not included in the sample. The field research was done under the auspices of the Mennonite Board of Missions and Charities and the Mennonite Research Foundation and was conducted from their offices at Elkhart and Goshen, Indiana. The analysis and tabulations were made in the statistical laboratory of the Pennsylvania State College, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology.

The questionnaire to out-group converts was mailed to 1,258 individuals. The return numbered 741, amounting to 59 per cent of the total who received the questionnaire. Only 726 were complete enough to use in the survey.

The questionnaire to ex-members was mailed to 652 individuals. The number returned was 284, which amounted to 43 per cent of the total ex-members who received the questionnaire. Only 278 were complete enough for use in the final tabulation.

Interviews were conducted to supplement the survey, to penetrate beneath the questionnaire responses, and to evaluate the attitudes, circumstances, and psychological factors associated with particular individual cases. Persons interviewed were selected from both rural and urban places. There were 24 interviews with out-group converts and 19 with ex-members.

Source of Gains

The largest proportion of out-group converts to the Mennonite Church came from other churches, rather than from the non-church population. The results of the survey reveal that 64.6 per cent of persons in the sample had previously held membership in other churches, Table 1. Approximately 35 per cent reported no

previous religious affiliation. Seventy-one or 9.8 per cent of the sample of 726 gave no information on this question.

Upon close examination we find that 34.2 per cent of the out-group converts had previous affiliations with other Mennonite or similar groups. The Old Order Amish supplied 19.4 per cent of all out-group converts. The largest proportion of the out-group converts from other Mennonite sources were from churches more traditional in religious practices than the Mennonite Church. The assumption that persons in the more traditional Mennonite groups who desire more freedom tend to affiliate with the Mennonite Church would seem to be substantiated.

Of all out-group converts, 30.4 per cent came from a wide selection of general American churches. From the general Protestant churches, the largest proportions came from Methodist, Lutheran, and Baptist groups.

Table 1. Sources of Out-Group Converts to the Mennonite Church by Previous Religious Affiliation, 1942-51.

Religious affiliation	Number	Per cent of total
No previous religious affiliation	232	35.4
Other Mennonite or similar churches	(224)	(34.2)
Old Order Amish	127	19.4
Conservative Amish Mennonite	33	5.0
Church of the Brethren	22	3.4
General Conference Mennonite	12	1.8
Miscellaneous Mennonite Groups[1]	30	4.6
General American Churches	(199)	(30.4)
Methodist	44	6.7
Lutheran	30	4.6
Baptist	24	3.7
Catholic	20	3.1
Presbyterian	14	2.1
"Fundamental" churches[2]	12	1.8
Other general Protestant[3]	55	8.4
Total	655	100.0

[1] Old Order Mennonite 9, Brethren in Christ 7, Mennonite Brethren in Christ 6, Kleine Gemeinde 4, Evangelical Mennonite 2, Bergthaler 1, Independent 1.

[2] Assemblies of God and Pentecostal 6, Christian Missionary Alliance 1, Church of God 3, Nondenominational 1, Salvation Army 1.

[3] United Brethren 9, Reformed 8, Christian Church 7, Evangelical 7, United Church of Canada 4, Church of England 4, Continental European churches 3, Congregational 3, Protestant undesignated 3, Episcopal 2, and one each for Evangelical and Reformed, Evangelical United Brethren, Federated, Friends, and Mormon.

Of the converts, 232 persons or 35.4 per cent had no previous church membership. The assumption is that a large proportion of this number are persons whose parents were either Old Order Amish or Mennonite, that they were not actually "non-church" people in the sense of having had no exposure to religious training. About 50 per cent of the converts having no previous membership came from homes where the father was a member of some Mennonite group.

Nineteen per cent were offspring of (old) Mennonite Church fathers and 15.6 per cent were offspring of Amish fathers. About 8 per cent of the 655 out-group converts represents the proportion of persons who theoretically had no exposure to religious training.

Membership Losses

Membership was terminated in several ways as indicated by the respondents. Thirty-six per cent said they quit attending, 24.8 per cent transferred membership, 19.8 per cent asked that their names be removed from the roll, and 14.0 per cent said they were excommunicated. There is no uniformity in method of termination of membership.

Table 2. Religious Affiliation of Ex-Members of the Mennonite Church, 1951.

Religious affiliation	Ex-Members Number	Per cent
No Affiliation	76	28.0
Other Mennonite or similar groups	(48)	(17.6)
General Conference Mennonite	12	4.4
Church of the Brethren	10	3.7
Conservative Amish Mennonite	7	2.6
United Missionary	6	2.2
Independent Mennonite groups	6	2.2
Brethren in Christ	3	1.1
Other Mennonites[1]	4	1.5
General American Churches	(148)	(54.4)
Methodist	31	11.4
Lutheran	22	8.9
Baptist	12	4.4
Evangelical United Brethren	11	4.0
Evangelical and Reformed	10	3.7
Presbyterian	9	3.3
Assembly of God and holiness groups	8	2.9
Nazarene	7	2.6
Catholic	5	1.8
Episcopal	5	1.8
Nondenominational groups	5	1.8
All others[2]	23	8.5
Total	272	100.0

[1] Kleine Gemeinde 2, Old Order Amish 1, Evangelical Mennonite 1.
[2] Church of God 4, Christian Church 3, Interdenominational 3, United Brethren 3, United Church of Canada 3, Disciples 2, Adventists 2, Congregational 1, Reformed 1, Salvation Army 1.

The assumption is made that persons leaving the Mennonite Church choose other religious denominations rather than no religion. The present religious affiliation of ex-members (former members) is shown in Table 2. From the sample of 272 ex-members, 72 per cent now belong to some other denomination. However, 17.6 per cent chose other Mennonite or similar denominations, most of which are more liberal in religious practices than the Mennonite Church. The proportion joining general American churches was 54.4 per cent. As in the case of accessions, the denominations claim-

ing the largest proportion were Methodist, Lutheran, and Baptist. In general, the findings indicate that the dissatisfied Mennonites chose a wide variety of denominations. Twenty-eight per cent of the ex-members had chosen no religious denomination at all at the time the survey was made.

Higher education is not associated with loss of religious affiliation, according to the findings. The education of church-affiliated ex-members as against nonchurch-affiliated ex-members is compared in Table 3. Of all ex-members who did not affiliate with any church, 32.9 per cent had attended or completed elementary school, 56.6 per cent had attended or completed high school, and 10.5 per cent had attended or completed college. Of those affiliating with a church, 28.0 per cent had attended or completed elementary school, 52.4 per cent attended or completed high school, and 18.6 per cent attended or completed college. The differences between proportions for church and nonchurch affiliation for elementary and high school are not statistically significant. For the college group the difference between the percentages approaches the level of significance, having a probability of less than 10 but more than 5 per cent that this difference would occur as the result of chance alone.

Of the 44 ex-members who had attended or completed college, 36 chose some religious affiliation, while eight chose no affiliation. This suggests that among the college group who leave the Mennonite Church, a higher proportion choose some church rather than no church. While the sample is small the difference between the frequencies is suggestive of a difference not due to chance.

Table 3. Education of Ex-Members by Church or Nonchurch Affiliation, 1942-51.

Grade attended or completed	Ex-Members			
	No affiliation		Church affiliated	
	Number	Per cent	Number*	Per cent
Elementary	25	32.9	54	28.0
High school	43	56.6	103	52.4
College	8	10.5	36	18.6
Total	76	100.0	193	100.0

* No response from 9 persons.
For college, P=between .10 and .05.

Of all members gained during the ten-year period 1942-51, rural churches had a smaller proportion of gains than did the urban churches. This trend coincides with the general trend of rural to urban migration.

Congregations in urban places are more effective in gaining outside converts than are the rural churches. Missions in rural and

urban places are about equally effective. Missions are more effective in gaining outside converts than are congregations. It takes 152 members in congregations to gain one out-group convert, and 23 members in missions to gain one such convert.

Membership losses are highest in urban churches, both for the congregations and missions. Rural churches win fewer converts, but they apparently hold their converts better than the urban churches.

On the average, about one outside convert is received into a Mennonite congregation each year. About 730 such persons are annually received into the Mennonite Church fellowship throughout the nation. Of the present total membership, approximately 12 per cent were received from outside (non-Mennonite Church) background. A survey of the ordained persons revealed that the same proportion held for out-group persons among all ordained persons. The ratio of membership losses to gains was one to eight. This means that for every eight persons received into the church, one member was lost.

Social Level of Members Gained and Lost

Sex: Men and women converts from out-group sources joined the Mennonite Church in about equal proportions. But of all ex-members there was a disproportionately smaller number of women. Therefore, more male members are lost than female.

It has been demonstrated from other church studies that women show more active interest in the church as indicated by attendance and membership, and this is thought to be true for both the nation as a whole and for the rural churches.

Age: Persons who join are of a younger age than the persons who leave, Table 4. Of all out-group persons who became members from 1942 to 1951, 16.7 per cent were 14 years old or under. For the same period, only 3.2 per cent of the same age group left the church. For ages 15-19 the difference between proportions was not significant, but was slightly higher among ex-members. The greatest loss over gains was for the 20-24 year age group, 20.1 as against 32.5 per cent. Since this is the age when members most frequently marry, it is quite possible that out-group marriages explain the high proportion of losses.

Few older persons leave the church. Of persons 50 years old or over, only eight of 249 ex-members left. A greater proportion of persons joined than left at age 50 or over.

Education: In general, ex-members completed more formal education than did converts, Table 5. Of all converts 21 years old

Table 4. Incoming and Outgoing Members of the Mennonite Church by Age, 1942-51.

Age	Converts		Ex-Members		Total	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
0-14	115	16.7	8	3.2	123	13.1**
15-19	130	18.9	54	21.7	184	19.7
20-24	138	20.1	81	32.5	219	23.4**
25-29	104	15.1	32	12.9	136	14.5
30-34	62	9.0	31	12.5	93	9.9
35-39	40	5.8	17	6.8	57	6.1
40-49	43	6.3	18	7.2	61	6.5
50-59	25	3.6	8	3.2	33	3.5
60 or over	31	4.5	0	0.0	31	3.3**
Total*	688	100.0	249	100.0	937	100.0

* No information for 38 converts and 29 ex-members.
** P=less than .001.
For all age categories, chi-square=54.20, P=less than .001.

or over at the time of joining the church, 60.2 per cent had terminated formal education after attending or completing elementary school, 31.0 per cent after attending or completing high school, and 8.8 per cent had attended or completed college. For ex-members 21 years old or more at the time of leaving, the proportions for the corresponding educational groups were 32.0, 49.4, and 18.6 per cent respectively. The findings indicate that of those (out-group) who join, the church is retaining a higher proportion of the elementary school group than it is losing, and it is losing a higher proportion of the high-school and college groups than it is retaining.

Table 5. Comparison of Converts and Ex-Members by Education Completed (21 years and over).

Attended or completed	Converts		Ex-Members	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Elementary	324	60.2	55	32.0
High school	167	31.0	85	40.4
College	47	8.8	32	18.6
Total*	538	100.0	172	100.0

* No information for 24 converts and 3 ex-members. For the college group, P= less than .01.

What is the meaning of this trend? The Mennonite Church is serving predominantly the elementary educational level. The more formal education a Mennonite Church member receives, the greater is the likelihood of his terminating membership in the church. But, as has been pointed out earlier, persons of a higher educational level do not drop church affiliation altogether in as large a proportion as do persons of the lower educational levels, Table 3. Persons of lower education have a greater tendency to lose interest in religion altogether, as measured by membership, than do persons with college education.

Income: The assumption is that persons with a high income are more likely to leave the church than persons with lower incomes. The converts were asked to state their annual income at the time of joining the church, and ex-members were asked to indicate their approximate income at the time of leaving the church. Of all persons gainfully employed in the samples, 292 converts and 163 ex-members responded to the question, Table 6.

The findings indicate that of those (out-group) who join, the church is retaining a higher proportion of the low income groups than it is losing, and it is losing a larger proportion of the higher income groups than it is retaining. Of those who joined the church, 15.8 per cent had incomes of $3,000 or more, but of all those who left 27.0 per cent had incomes of $3,000 or more. The difference is significant at the .01 per cent level.

Table 6. Gainfully Employed Converts and Ex-Members by Income, 1942-51.

	Converts		Ex-Members	
Income	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Under $500	66	22.6	13	8.0
$500-$1,499	94	32.2	55	33.7
$1,500-$2,999	86	29.4	51	31.3
$3,000-$4,499	26	9.0	25	15.3
$4,500 and over	20	6.8	19	11.7
Total*	292	100.0	163	100.0

*No information for 74 converts and 24 ex-members. For converts and ex-members, P=less than .01; chi-square, 8.70.

In summary, lower income groups are reached more effectively than are upper income classes. This is just the reverse of the findings of several rural church studies reported by Experiment Stations in Agricultural Colleges in the United States. The Mennonite Church is probably more effective in serving the lower income groups than are some of the denominations operating in rural areas.

Occupation: Considerable difference was found in the proportion of converts and ex-members in the various occupational categories, Table 7. The assumption is that since the church as a whole is predominantly rural, persons who engage in other occupations tend to leave in larger numbers than those in the dominant occupational group.

Of all converts, 48.9 per cent were farmers or farm managers, but of all ex-members, only 20.1 per cent were farmers. This would indicate that more out-group farmers prefer to remain with the Mennonite Church than do persons in any of the other occupational groups.

These occupational groups having losses which were significant-

ly larger than the proportion of converts gained were: professional and semiprofessional; proprietors, managers, and officials; clerical, sales, and kindred workers; and service workers except domestic and protective. Only the farmer group had gains in converts which were significantly greater than the proportion of losses. This means that the persons with occupations other than farming, for the most part, leave in greater proportions than out-group converts joining with the same occupation.

Occupations having the largest proportion of the total converts were: farmer and farm managers; craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers; and laborers except farm.

An "occupational norm" for the Mennonite Church is given in Table 7. These data are from an occupational study of the Mennonite Church made by the Mennonite Research Foundation in 1950, having been obtained through questionnaires from family household heads. When compared to the "norm," those occupational groups having a significantly larger proportion of converts were: craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers, and farm and other laborers. Proportions of converts which were significantly smaller than the Mennonite norm were in two occupational groups: professional and semiprofessional, and proprietors, managers, and officials.

Table 7. Converts and Ex-Members Gainfully Employed by Occupation, 1942-51, Compared to the Mennonite Norm of Occupations, 1950.

Occupational group	Occupational Norm*		Converts		Ex-Members	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Professional and semiprofessional	1,166	8.6	7	2.3	24	13.7
Farmers and farm managers	6,175	45.4	152	48.9	35	20.1
Proprietors, managers, and officials	1,240	9.1	5	1.6	9	5.1
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	1,247	9.2	22	7.1	29	16.6
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred	807	5.9	42	13.5	21	12.0
Operatives and kindred workers	1,253	9.2	26	8.4	16	9.1
Domestic service workers	808	5.9	9	2.9	1	.5
Protective service workers	8	.0	2	.6	14	8.0
Service workers except domestic, etc.	3	.0	6	1.9	4	2.2
Farm laborers and foremen	118	.9	10	3.2	5	2.8
Laborers except farm	781	5.8	30	9.6	16	9.9
Total	13,606	100.0	311	100.0	174	100.0

*Obtained from Mennonite Occupational Study, Mennonite Research Foundation, 1950.

Significance of differences by the chi-square test:
For occupational norm and converts: P=less than .001; chi-square, 85.81.
For occupational norm and ex-members: P=less than .001; chi-square, 70.48.
For converts and ex-members: P=less than .001; chi-square, 67.79.

When the "norm" was compared to ex-members, those occupational groups having proportions significantly larger than the "norm" were: professional and semiprofessional; clerical, sales, and

kindred workers; craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers; service workers except domestic and protective, and farm and other laborers. Proportions of ex-members in occupational groups which were significantly smaller than the "norm" were only the farmers and farm managers.

The general conclusions with regard to occupation may be summarized as follows: the largest proportion of the out-group converts to the Mennonite Church are represented in the farm and farm manager group. Of all out-group persons joining, the church is retaining a larger proportion of the farmers than of any other occupation group.

In-Group and Out-Group Marriages: To determine whether marriage was associated with incoming and outgoing members each respondent was asked whether he married a Mennonite Church member. The number of persons leaving the church who married out-group persons is greater in proportion than that of converts who married in-group persons.

Of the 465 married out-group converts, 43 per cent married Mennonite Church members. Fifty-seven per cent of the converts married persons other than Mennonite Church members. Presumably they also brought their marriage partners into the church. There was little difference in regard to sex for the number of converts who married Mennonite Church members.

Of the 227 married ex-members, 70 per cent married out-group spouses. Only 30 per cent of the persons leaving the church had married Mennonite Church members. The proportion of men choosing spouses outside the church was not significantly different from that of women.

Converts who join the Mennonite Church from out-group sources probably do so to obtain a spouse, at least in some cases. It is conceivable that a person confronted with the problem of choosing between a Mennonite spouse and his religious belief will choose the spouse and sacrifice his religious belief, or will be willing to accommodate his beliefs to a factor which means more to him.

Findings which are most significant will be summarized in the following paragraphs. It should be borne in mind that the samples were drawn at random from the church as a whole, across the entire United States and from congregations regardless of size or location.

In summary, outsiders join the church in about equal proportions from both sexes, but more men than women leave the church. The largest proportion of persons joining from the outside are

young persons, for the most part, under age 21. The largest proportions leave the church from the ages of 15-30.

More college trained persons leave the church than join. The church is attracting persons primarily from the elementary educational level. The higher the formal education attained, the greater is the tendency to leave the church. However, college-trained persons who leave choose other denominations more readily than do persons who leave with only elementary education.

The church is gaining more persons from the low income class than it is losing, and it is losing larger proportions of persons from the upper income classes than it is gaining. Whether this tendency is greater or lesser than 25 or 50 years ago cannot be answered from the findings.

Persons joining the church are primarily farmers, craftsmen, and laborers. The church retains farmers who join better than professional, sales, and clerical workers, and other occupational groups.

Associational Behavior

Persons who make up a group are somehow held together. Common tradition and sustenance considerations are two fundamental factors which hold groups together. Cultural ties such as common nationality, language, religion, and values are other types of sociological bonds.

Type of Contact Most Effective: In the present study, each Mennonite Church member of non-Mennonite parentage was asked: "In your judgment, what contacts with the Mennonites led you to become a member?" In addition to checking certain possible reasons for joining, each was asked to explain in his own words why he joined the Mennonite Church. Of the 726 responses, half of them wrote reasons on the back of the questionnaire.

The types of contacts resulting in conversion as judged by the respondents are given in Table 8. Each respondent was asked to check one or more items from a number of possible answers. Attendance at Sunday school was checked most frequently. Others in their numerical order were: the influence of some friend, evangelistic services, home visitation, summer Bible school, reading Mennonite literature, service or relief contacts (including Civilian Public Service experience and voluntary service), attendance at a Mennonite school, and radio broadcasting.

These findings seem to indicate that the primary or face-to-face kind of activity is associated with incoming converts to a greater degree than the more limited or secondary contacts. Small groups,

such as Sunday-school discussions, and the influence of a single person on another are more effective in getting converts than are the printed page, attendance at college, or least of all, radio broadcasting. These, in brief, are the types of contacts which resulted in membership in the church as judged by the converts themselves.

Table 8. Types of Religious Activity Effective in Converting Out-Group Persons to the Mennonite Church, 1942-51.

Kind of Activity	Reasons given by Converts	
	Number	Per cent
Attendance at Sunday school	253	23.0
Through the influence of some friend	232	21.9
Evangelistic services	215	20.2
Home visitation	178	16.7
Summer Bible school	87	8.2
Reading Mennonite literature	54	5.8
Institutional service or relief work	19	1.8
Attendance at a Mennonite school	15	1.4
Radio Broadcasting	11	1.0
Total	1,064	100.0
Number respondents	(711)	

The presence of family names not of Swiss or German derivation among Mennonite Church members is evidence of social assimilation. A few such names are: Adams, Burton, Conley, Dixon, Eggenwhiles, Fedorov, Glazener, Gomez, Hanson, Heffren, Hollis, Houser, Jones, Linhoss, McCan, McCain, McCammon, McLean, O'Connell, Peleski, Porter, Pytel, Randolph, Rogers, Simpson, Soma, Skrieveseth, Soboleski, Taylor, Thompson, Tunnincliff, West, Wilkens, and others.

Persons of many nationalities and diverse cultures have become members of the Mennonite Church in North America. Among those in the present generation other than German or Swiss are: Austrian, Hungarian, Norwegian, English, Italian, Mexican, Polish, Scotch, Irish, Welsh, Dutch, French, Russian, Danish, Philippine, Japanese, Bohemian, American Indian, and Jewish. These persons are, however, only a small minority of the total Mennonite Church membership.

Persons from other than Mennonite background become members of the Mennonite Church for many different reasons. There are certain distinct values of the group which attract nonmembers. The comments from respondents will be summarized below.

Broadly speaking, there are two types of converts. There are converts by "convincement," and there are converts by "convenience."

The former manifest aggressive behavior in seeking out the basic beliefs of the Mennonite Church; they react favorably and submerge their personal values to those of the group. They become members primarily by personal conviction after a positive search for a satisfying personal religious philosophy.

"Converts by convenience" are those who become members because it is convenient or socially advantageous. The social situation they find themselves in makes it more convenient to become a member than to remain as they are. Marriage, proximity, and liberation from previous unpleasant church connections render it convenient for them to become members of the Mennonite Church.

The underlying assumption as stated in the beginning of this study is that certain associational factors or attributes of the group attract persons to the Mennonite Church system of values. The original question was: "What are the associational factors which attract 'outside' persons to the church?" The findings as based on the reasons given by the respondents appear below in summary statements. For lack of space only a few comments directly from the respondents can be given.

Persons desiring a specific type of religious experience or set of values become members of the Mennonite Church. These respondents feel that Mennonites "live their beliefs," and maintain "pure" or "sound" doctrine. They are interested in the religious values of the Mennonite Church apart from any social factors mentioned.

These religious values are: (1) "conversion" of the person by supernatural "regeneration"; (2) Biblicism—conformity to the direct teachings of the Bible, especially the New Testament; (3) respect for group discipline and conformity; and (4) the "practice" of religious beliefs in all of life's situations including commitment to nonresistance and nonconformity.

A day laborer and former member of the Christian Reformed Church said: "They live up to what they believe. I cannot say that for the church I belonged to."

A former Lutheran, baptized into the Mennonite Church at age 38, said: "I admired Christianity over the pulpit and in the pews the same. They sincerely attempted to live what they professed and had faith instead of fancy churches."

Other comments on the same subject follow.

"The Mennonites have a religion that seems to take in every-

thing and yet not make a person miserable being religious. I do not like this being a Christian just on Sundays or on the church roll."

"The Mennonite Church seems to give the most complete spiritual fulfillment; they seem to practice what they preach. They don't forget what the sermon or the Sunday-school lesson was about, but live their religion through the week."

Some respondents not only felt that Mennonites "lived their beliefs" but that they also professed beliefs which were "nearest to those in the Bible." Using the teaching of Scripture as a criterion for selecting a fellowship group was important to them. Whether or not "all" of the Bible doctrines were practiced was equally important to them.

Persons become members because of strong social attachment to one or more members of the group. Continual and repeated contacts of nonmembers with members result in favorable attitudes toward the Mennonite Church.

In some cases social considerations, such as marriage, outweigh any personal antagonisms for the Mennonite religious values. Other social ties are: acceptance—"a feeling of being needed," employment by Mennonite persons, family considerations, friendship or favorableness toward a specific person, and attendance at a Mennonite school, institution, or service agency.

A former Baptist telephone operator reports: "I became engaged to a Mennonite boy. We discussed it a lot and I decided to join. I felt at home and enjoyed the service so much I think I would have joined even if we hadn't become engaged."

Another former Baptist writes: "To have a happy home we decided we must worship at the same church. I'm glad I joined as I believe wholly in everything they stand for and I'm happy. A Baptist and Mennonite have a lot of the same beliefs."

A Catholic registered nurse met an Amish young man while serving in a mental hospital during wartime. Both decided to leave their former affiliations and join the Mennonite Church. Other factors influencing the wife's decisions were: "My father had left the Catholics, joined a Protestant group, and had become a 'new man.' In a short time I realized that these nice friendly people had a kind of happiness, a peace, and an assurance in their lives that I did not have in mine. I started to read about the Mennonites and their doctrine, and started to read the Bible for the first time. I have found that happiness, peace, and assurance that I saw in the lives of those whom I met in that (hospital) unit, and these years have been the happiest in my life."

Persons who feel restrained in their previous religious affiliation become members of the Mennonite Church. Certain converts have religious backgrounds similar to but often more traditional than the Mennonite Church. They are Amish, Old Order German Baptist, Brethren in Christ, and other Mennonite groups. These persons seek liberation from personal restraints without making any major changes in their religious beliefs.

Dislike for the previous affiliation is inducement for strong attachment to the Mennonite Church. The controls they sought to be freed from are: use of the German language; tradition—manifest in clothing, forms of worship, and closed communities; taboos on modern inventions affecting agriculture—tractors, cars, and trucks; and the doctrine of shunning. The converts who desire more personal liberty express their satisfaction with the Sunday school. They find a more wholesome environment in which to rear children, and find opportunity for formal education, religious activity, and missionary work.

A former Amishman said: "They [the Amish] have retained a pattern of social behavior of former customs and traditions which in my mind did not fit one to live capably in present American society. One could not do constructive things in all details without hindrances of tradition and accumulated mannerisms, which are an impediment to do daily work." Further comments from former Amish persons follow.

"As a farmer who wants to do a good job I wanted a tractor, truck, car, and such which was not allowed in our church."

"We did not have time to teach our children the German after sending them to school and on Sunday try to teach them the way of salvation in German."

"The conduct among the Old Order young people was far from what I thought it should be—smoking, drinking, smutty stories, lack of opportunity for service, no Bible teaching."

"I was in darkness about the Bible and salvation. . . . I didn't want my children to grow up in ignorance. . . . There was more opportunity to take part and help in church work."

Persons become members because of place of residence, life crises, and circumstances. A variety of situational factors are associated with out-group converts who become members. They are: nearness to a Mennonite place of worship, accessibility to other churches, sickness or death of a relative, and other "acts of God." A variety of comments from various persons follow.

"I came from a small town where a Protestant service was

held once a month by the Presbyterians. The only other church was Catholic. After much conviction of the Holy Spirit I yielded to His call."

"My husband and I joined because it was close to our home, just across the road."

"The reason I joined the Mennonite Church was because there weren't any churches closer to where I lived, and they used cars to pick up the people who didn't have a way."

"The only Protestant church in my community was a Mennonite mission. Although I am quite happy, I must admit that circumstances are what brought me into the brotherhood."

A boy of 15 writes: "My parents let me go to church with the neighbor who was a Mennonite. My parents liked the Mennonites because they were friendly."

Dissociational Factors

No group carries on without stresses and conflict among its members. Dissociation refers to the absence of smooth and co-ordinated adaptation of the members to the behavioral norms and mores of the group. Perfect adjustment of the individual members to the group is an ideal. Group integration is never complete. Conflicts, revolts, and clashes between members of the group are always occurring. Within a group and between groups, there is a constant struggle of diverse elements, hindrances, repressions, exploitations, and competitive interests and jealousies which interfere with the harmony of the individual and the group. Individuals tend to select associations which offer optimum satisfaction and the least amount of personal frustration.

Every person who becomes a member of the Mennonite group interacts not only with others, but with his own system of values, his own interests and attitudes previously acquired. His own values are constantly reinforced, modified, and shaped by those of the group. The interaction between values of the person and of the group is a constant ongoing process. Theoretically, at least, his attachment to the group does not remain static, but becomes more favorable or less favorable, depending on the factors of adjustment.

In the questionnaire, each ex-member was asked to respond to the question: "In your judgment what was the principal reason for your withdrawal from the Mennonite Church?" Two fifths of the 278 questionnaires returned contained explanatory information, some of them generous and even of a biographical nature. Table 9

gives a tabular summary of the reasons offered in the 278 questionnaires.

Table 9. Reasons Given by Ex-Members for Leaving the Church, 1942-51.

Reason	Reason		Number reasons	
	Number	Per cent	Men	Women
Restrictions affecting practical behavior:	(199)	(30.2)	(124)	(75)
Disagree with nonresistance	69	10.4	60	9
The discipline was too strict	67	10.1	44	23
Dress restrictions (in general)	36	5.4	15	21
Headdress and hair styles	19	2.9	3	16
Could see nothing wrong with jewelry	8	1.2	2	6
Religious:	(154)	(23.3)	(74)	(80)
Spiritual hunger	47	7.1	26	21
Disagree on doctrine related to salvation	22	3.3	14	8
Church is not missionary-minded enough	17	2.6	7	10
Good pastor and Bible teaching lacking	15	2.3	7	8
Church teaches too little about holiness	14	2.1	7	7
Favored musical instruments in worship	10	1.5	4	6
Backslide in spiritual matters	9	1.4	3	6
The church is too worldly	8	1.2	3	5
Too many church fights, irreverence	7	1.1	3	4
Favor more nondenominational emphasis	5	.8	0	5
Restrictions affecting thought control:	(131)	(19.8)	(82)	(49)
Culturally and intellectually narrow	48	7.3	30	18
Disagree with Mennonite doctrine	45	6.8	24	21
Disagreement with the leadership	38	5.8	28	10
Social reasons:	(112)	(17.0)	(52)	(60)
Married a non-Mennonite	92	13.9	44	48
Family reasons, and related	10	1.5	3	7
Disagree with the stand on divorce	5	.8	3	2
Was snobbed by Mennonites	5	.8	2	3
Geographic (or occupational):				
Moved away from the Mennonite community	60	9.1	23	37
Economic reasons:	4	.6	3	1
Total	660	100.0	358	302
Number respondents	(278)		(150)	(128)

There are many reasons given for losing membership affiliation. No single factor explains this phenomenon. A person, for example, may have several reasons for leaving the church. He might have married outside, disliked the preaching, disagreed with the dress regulations, and moved away from the community. Which of the several reasons is mainly responsible? It is admitted that any classification of the responses is somewhat arbitrary, but the generous comments indicate some patterns of behavior for serious consideration.

Whether the reasons given by respondents were the "real" reasons is not known. A few responses were antagonistic, some sought to justify their leaving the church by pointing out the "faults" of other members, but in most of the responses no antagonistic attitudes could be detected. Some of the "better" comments will be

used as source material for relating the disorganizing factors associated with membership loss. They are not necessarily typical. Places and persons are anonymous.

Persons who desire greater "practice freedom" than that permitted by the mores and standards of the group lose their membership affiliation. There were some who deliberately and otherwise violated the church discipline. They felt too restricted in their personal life. They wanted more liberty. Specific (material) "things" stood in their way. Women dissented to certain hair styles, long hair, bonnets, a set pattern for dresses, and the prohibition of jewelry. Men were less specific; some objected to the "plain" dress for their wives, to the "plain coat," and to certain economic habits.

A large proportion of the respondents indicated their dislike for discipline pertaining to dress—regulation styles, manner of dressing the hair, length of women's hair, wedding bands and rings, jewelry, use of make-up—and other restrictions which conflict with personal values.

A single girl, age 16 at the time of leaving the church, says, "I disagree with Mennonite teaching that woman's hair should not be cut. I realize it is a woman's glory. I don't approve of real short hair but a little below shoulder length. There are too many people in the church I attended who live two lives. They wear their wedding bands all through the week and take them off on Sunday. They have real short hair and permanents and fix it up so the preachers can't tell the difference on Sunday."

"I don't care for the Mennonite bondage of women's dress because I can't sew like that. Christians can buy sensible clothing that covers them well, and in this day of speed I couldn't see neglecting more important duties to make dresses, when the men buy their clothes ready-made."

Another said: "I think that too many Amish are coming into the Mennonite Church and the only reason is so they can have cars and tractors. If they want to dress Amish, let them go back to the Amish church."

Persons who hold beliefs conflicting with those of the Mennonite Church lose their membership affiliation. These persons dissented in intellectual matters, certain doctrines or beliefs apart from any material manifestation. Subjects mentioned were the love of God as against the severity of preaching "man-made laws," mode of baptism, Sabbath observance (due to Adventist influence), "eternal security," and opposition to the use of the lot for selecting preachers. The nature of church government was discussed by some. With

the amount of comments received on interdenominationalism, nondenominationalism, and in some cases antidenominationalism, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that such persons are influenced substantially by other "sectarian" groups and by the fundamentalist system of thought.

"It took a number of years of unrest and unsatisfied longing before I left the Mennonite Church. It was through the instrumentality of the Mennonite Church that I learned to know the Lord, but the severity of the preaching of sin and judgment seemed to overshadow my grasp of God's love in my childhood."

A male of age 20 who probably desired more opportunity for religious leadership wrote: "Only after I changed to the Methodists did I correctly understand my calling to God's service in the ministry. I have been ordained by God and not by man's lottery. That is one part of Mennonite doctrine I don't agree with."

Several respondents made reference to the nature of the Bible. "I disagree with the plenary and verbal inspiration theory of the Bible. [I left because of the] incompetence and presumption of the majority of preachers. Generally speaking in my opinion they look at the world through the window of a country schoolroom."

A response from a middle-aged mother reveals strong feelings about Mennonite preaching against Catholics. "I always heard some of the most terrible things told from the Mennonite pulpits concerning the Catholic Church. This led me to get hold of all Catholic literature I could find and study it. My children are leaders in the [Catholic] Church."

A person who has been engaged in missionary work asks, "Why glory in a denomination? Why work up devotion and loyalty to a group? Why advertise your church? Jesus said, 'Ye shall be witnesses unto ME.' Why not let that be the emphasis? Christ is the Saviour. He saves. He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Belonging to this or that denomination is no assurance of eternal life. Why deify the denomination?"

Persons who experience feelings of nonacceptance in the Mennonite Church lose their membership affiliation. Members left because they did not feel accepted by the group. The bonds of identification were weak and lacking in sufficient number and depth to assimilate them. There were antagonisms between Mennonites by heritage and Mennonites by conversion expressed by words and phrases such as "special privileges," "outsider," "convert," "cold-shoulder treatment," "clique," "snobby," "holier than thou," "cold reception," and others. There were some reactions to emphasizing

Mennonite history, "cultural piety," and things related to "Mennonitism."

"I was raised in a Mennonite Children's Home. I couldn't have had a better foster mother, but as time went on and as children do occasionally if they make a half misstep, I was looked down upon. I was told that wild blood was born in my veins, etc. But those who were born in Mennonite homes got away with far more."

"(Mennonites) except a very, very few form a kind of clique to themselves. If you aren't offspring of Mennonites you are on the outside, not spiritual enough to live an overcoming life."

"When occasionally a stranger or an unsaved person came to the church everyone just walked past and stared at them like an outcast. The people as a whole in this section are one-track minded and are busy watching for something to criticize. I don't believe all Mennonites are like that."

"Too much stress is placed on Mennonite history—Mennonitism instead of fundamentals of spiritual growth, such as adoption, justification, sanctification, etc."

Persons lose their membership because of strong identification with one or more persons in groups other than the Mennonite Church. There are certain social attractions outside the Mennonite group. Marriage seems to be the greatest. Divorced and remarried persons cannot find acceptance in the Mennonite group. Persons whose kinship ties outweigh those of religion leave their Mennonite affiliation. Certain occupations are associated with persons who leave. Since the mores permit almost any kind of specialized training other than military, Mennonites often leave their locality. The distance between their job and church is too great. They would rather change churches than change jobs. A few young persons desire recreational activities which are forbidden by the church. A certain percentage of draft age boys enter military service. Some comments follow.

"I have nothing against the Mennonites. They are good people. But the reason I do not belong to them is because they do not approve of divorce. Their preaching in general is not as strong as it ought to be. It is too dead."

"I feel that I can render the most valuable service in the field of music. I have more opportunity to use my talents in another denomination. I have directed the same choir [for 15 years]. At times I directed two additional choirs."

"The Mennonite Church had been the church of my choice ever since I joined. When my employment took me to ——, I found it

difficult to attend. During this period of about 20 years, I attended regularly the Lutheran and Brethren churches and had a perfect Sunday-school attendance of nearly 15 years. Since the Brethren Church is nearly of the same faith, including feet-washing, I decided to transfer to the Brethren."

Persons lose their membership because they desire a religious experience or type of expression not offered by the Mennonite Church. For the most part, these persons described the experience they sought in phrases such as "baptism of the Holy Ghost," "holiness," and "old-fashioned revival." They joined sectarian or nondenominational movements. Dissatisfied worshipers mentioned irreverence in worship service, the desirability of instrumental music, and the type of preaching. Some did not appreciate "practical" sermons, those related to life situations. Others felt that proper pastoral leadership was lacking and that sermons were too legalistic, not meeting the psychological tensions and conflicts of the worshipers.

There was very limited opportunity for using one's ability in religious activities according to a few, and about the same number felt that the church was too "worldly." A minority admitted backsliding and gave some evidence of religious confusion in their thinking.

"I always had a longing for something deeper than I got in the Mennonite Church. Upon going to several Pentecostal meetings I realized that their Christianity was more real than mine and that they had what I desired to have, the baptism of the Holy Ghost. I can truthfully say that it is an experience outside of conversion because I experienced it and I know it's real. The more I saw Pentecost in the Bible the more our Mennonite preacher preached against it. That was the only reason I quit attending the church."

"There is no holiness preached from your pulpit, and in the Word of God holines is the main theme. There is too much social life and not enough Spirit-filled living among the young people."

"The preaching had for a long while seemed a rather dreamy and theoretical thing—inapplicable to the real problems of living. I have known intimately many Mennonite young people who had intense inner emotional conflicts—a result of, in my estimation, poor religion. To be more specific, it is not enough for a person to hear, 'Christ is the answer,' 'Just pray,' 'Just yield yourselves to Him.' That seemed to be about as concrete as most sermons became."

"We went three years to a Mennonite church but were disappointed in the worldly dress of the Mennonites. We couldn't raise our children in that church unless we would want them looking like the world."

These, then, are the factors associated with membership loss as based upon the reasons given by the ex-members themselves. It will be observed that some persons join the Mennonite Church for the same reason that others leave. This phenomenon will be dealt with below.

Concluding Evaluation

From interview materials and from observation of Mennonite missions some general observations not subject to quantitative treatment are offered in conclusion.

Conversions result from both deliberate and unanticipated contacts. Deliberate contacts are those activities maintained by the group with an evangelistic intent. Unanticipated contacts are those resulting from chance, proximity, or as "by-products" of the interaction process. The former implies a planned stategy of action, a state of expectancy, and the interaction is induced by the group doing the evangelizing, while in the latter, conversions are by-products of the social situations encountered.

This dichotomy would seem to raise a fundamental question: Is the type of evangelistic contact, whether deliberate or unanticipated, functionally related to the degree of acceptance of the group's values? In other words, do persons evangelized by unanticipated contacts make "better" members, do they more completely accept the beliefs and practices of the group than those evangelized by deliberate evangelistic contacts? The study is not designed to test this assumption but the findings indicate that this may be a problem for further investigation.

The quality of the evangelistic contact, whether primary or secondary association, is functionally related to the number of converts gained and retained. Allowing for certain exceptions, the Mennonite Church is a cultural group of the *Gemeinschaft* (fellowship) type. It has the qualities of an informal group, therefore contacts resulting in conversions are dominantly face-to-face rather than secondary. The fellowship type of evangelism is most effective.

Attendance at Sunday school, friendship associations, and home visitation contacts are more effective in gaining converts than are contacts such as reading material, attendance at college, radio broadcasting, or institutional service contacts. We conclude there-

fore that persons who become members do so because they know intimately or face-to-face one or more members of the Mennonite Church. In a conventional American church it is probable that a person will become a member through secondary contacts, on the basis of his personal preferences for a type of secondary behavior such as social class phenomena and other secondary group manifestations.

Material traits of culture serve to identify the Mennonite mission program. The group is distinguished from other evangelical churches by style of dress, prohibition of musical instruments in the churches, the prayer veiling for women, and no bobbed hair for women. While both material and nonmaterial values are maintained and taught by the church, the material traits tend to become the symbol of "Mennonitism" in missionary work.

The study suggests that crisis situations in the life of a person are associated with active interest in religion. Persons affected by fire, death, sickness, or disaster apparently have greater receptivity to the Mennonite teaching than others not subjected to this experience. This phenomenon is associated with the unanticipated contact mentioned above. Persons receiving assistance from Mennonite persons in the form of mutual aid—labor, gifts-in-kind, cash donations, or personal effects—respond to Mennonite persons and in turn sometimes become interested in their religion. The problem of personal crisis deserves further study.

Most of the urban missions lack leadership with sufficient training and experience to perpetuate the Mennonite system of values. This conclusion is supported by two major factors: the city missions utilize persons in their teaching programs from other churches (e.g., Moody in Chicago) with different beliefs than the Mennonite group, and the diversified type of activity carried on in the city requires persons with greater skill and training than does evangelistic work in the rural environment.

Mennonite urban missions have not made appropriate adaptations with the changes in ecology, industrial developments, and population mobility. Some of the oldest missions serve a "special interest group" of persons who live many miles away from the place of worship. The area surrounding several missions changed from an original "slum" district to a lower-middle class society. In other instances there were changes in nationality groups living in the community.

Urban missions serve the old and the young, and provide almost no associations for young people of mature age. The Mennon-

ite city mission program may be adapted to "save the soul" of the young person, but it is poorly equipped to save him socially and to make of him a resident member of a church community. This seems to be a problem common to all missions in urban communities.

It has been observed that frequently persons become members for the same reason that others lose their membership. The attitudes of individuals are harmonious or antagonistic depending upon the degree of favorableness, personal like or dislike, for the group. The Mennonite Church is a carrier of certain standards and norms of belief and conduct. Persons become members because their own values coincide with those of the group, or because certain needs are met by associations with the group. Mutual adjustment between culture elements and the values held by the individual results in group solidarity. There is common agreement on values or culture elements shared by both the individual and the group.

Since some persons join the church for the same reason that others leave it, a certain fundamental question may be asked. Is there a certain type of personality that is attracted to the Mennonite Church set of values? The answer in most cases is probably "no." We have observed that the converts of missions are largely children or young people. They join before they are mature, before they are old enough to formulate any fundamental and lasting concepts about religion. It is difficult to construct a personality type from such young converts. Furthermore, most Mennonite missions are so similar to the general evangelical churches that the personality factor would probably be indistinguishable from that of the converts to other churches.

The numerous ecclesiastical "splits" among the Mennonites is evidence of divergent opinion and differing schools of thought. With the Anabaptist emphasis on the Bible and individual conscience as the final authority, as opposed to church or hierarchy, contention and strife have often resulted. The source of protest arises within the individual when he begins to realize that he cannot personally fulfill the demands of the religious group. This protest brings about social disorganization.

Such ecclesiastical divisions have developed around a conservative-liberal continuum, whereby a person can move from a conservative to a liberal group without losing altogether his Mennonite identity. The figures on gains and losses of members in this study suggest that the Mennonite Church is one "rung" on the "ladder" leading from conservatism to liberalism, from the sacred to the secular type of society (secularization process).

Another theoretical problem is the relation of evangelism to contradictions between belief and practice. It is admitted in many social groups that there is a dual system of ethics, a norm of "belief" and another of "practice." There are *ideological norms* and *behavioral norms* of conduct. In theological terminology the ideological norm might be comparable to "orthodoxy" and the behavioral norm to "orthopraxy"—the norm of "right" action or practice.

There are a number of examples of contradiction between belief and practice in modern society. The Kinsey report is fundamentally suggestive of a set of beliefs held by certain religious persons with respect to sex morality, but on the practice level those belief norms were violated. The Hartshorne and May study of cheating as related to Sunday-school attendance of elementary school pupils is similarly suggestive. A nutritional study reported by Pauline Mack of the Pennsylvania State College indicates that families with "good educational backgrounds" possessed adequate knowledge about necessary nutritional requirements but ". . . didn't care about the basic principles of nutrition." This contradictory phenomenon is also manifest in religious behavior. One author reporting on *The Religion of College Teachers* concluded that although college professors held Christian beliefs they did not seem to be affected by these beliefs in the interpretations of their subjects or in their thinking about education.

Do persons join and leave the Mennonite Church to adjust their practice behavior to their beliefs? Does the evangelistic process tend to minimize the contradictions between belief and practice of the "convert"? The study was not designed to answer this question. That the flow of incoming and outgoing members is functionally related to the individual's adjustment of belief to an appropriate practice would seem to be a fruitful explanation.

A Mennonite member who discovers that he cannot fulfill the demands of his professed belief becomes frustrated. This frustration may take on the form of agression, resulting in deliberate and willful violation of the church discipline or the mores. The boredom and frustration resulting from contradictions between belief and practice in a group which attempts to control belief and enforce conformity would tend to foster mobility out of the group.

When contradictions between belief and practice become too great for the individual he seeks a method for readjusting the two. One way is the "revival" or "reconsecration." This is often done in public during the evangelistic services. In this way he confesses

to past hypocrisy but renews his determination to live the belief. The other method of resolving the conflict and escaping frustration is to choose another group which permits practices that more nearly conform to the belief.

The presence of so many converts from former Amish and other groups of conservative Mennonite background in the Mennonite Church would substantiate this assumption. Persons who desire a greater range of "practice" behavior find escape from frustration by becoming members of the Mennonite Church. Persons who previously were prohibited from using tractors or cars find that they can practice their beliefs with less contradiction than previously.

Persons leave the church for the same reason. Those who do not respond to "revivals" or reconsecrations and who cannot bring their practices into conformity with the professed beliefs, associate with a group which permits practice more nearly conforming to their belief. This would account for the large proportion of ex-members who join other (liberal) Mennonite groups and the larger Protestant denominations.

Beliefs change for a variety of reasons. Many Mennonites change their beliefs because of influences from other religious groups, but also because of the fact of physical and mental maturity. In a study of social factors in moral development Jean Piaget found that the main factor in the conformity of young children was respect for age. As the person grows from childhood to adulthood the nature of his respect changes. At the same time the person's moral consciousness undergoes certain changes. The same study reported that the child's notion of justice changes as a function of the mental age, reciprocity asserts itself with age, and the desire for equality increases with age. As soon as the person is freed from the domination of those older than himself, he tends toward co-operation as the normal form of social equilibrium, according to this source. This may explain why Mennonite members, many of whom are baptized in adolescence, lose their interest and membership a few years later.

This article is part of a 1953 Ph.D. dissertation written and accepted at The Pennsylvania State College under Professor William G. Mather, entitled *The Sociology of Mennonite Evangelism.*

ATTENDANCE IN MENNONITE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1951-52

SILAS HERTZLER

Herewith is presented the twenty-fourth tabulation of attendance statistics for Mennonite Secondary Schools and Colleges in the United States and Canada. The names and exact addresses of the schools included are as follows:

Mennonite Biblical Seminary, 4614 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago 15, Illinois
Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana
Eastern Mennonite College, Harrisonburg, Virginia
Bethel College, North Newton, Kansas
Hesston College and Bible School, Hesston, Kansas
Grace Bible Institute, 1515 South Tenth Street, Omaha 8, Nebraska
Lancaster Mennonite School, Route 4, Lancaster, Pennsylvania
Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio
Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kansas
Immanuel Academy, Corner West and Curtis, Reedley, California
Bethel College, 1000 North McKinley Avenue, Mishawaka, Ind.
Freeman Junior College, Freeman, South Dakota
Pacific Bible Institute, 2149 Tuolumne Street, Fresno 21, California
Mennonite Brethren Collegiate Institute, 173 Talbot Avenue, Winnipeg, Manitoba
Eden Bible and High School, Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario
Iowa Mennonite School, Kalona, Iowa
Mennonite Brethren Bible College, 77 Kelvin St., Winnipeg, Man.
Mennonite Collegiate Institute, Gretna, Manitoba
Corn Bible Academy, Corn, Oklahoma
United Mennonite Educational Institute, Leamington, Ontario
Emmanuel Bible College, Kitchener, Ontario
Rockway Mennonite School, Route 3, Kitchener, Ontario
Alberta Mennonite High School, Coaldale, Alberta
Berean Academy, Elbing, Kansas
Central Kansas Bible Academy, Hutchinson, Kansas
Bethel Deaconess Hospital School of Nursing, Newton, Kansas
Rosthern Junior College, Rosthern, Saskatchewan
Steinbach Bible Academy, Steinbach, Manitoba
Bloomington Mennonite School of Nursing, Bloomington, Illinois
Canadian Mennonite Bible College, 515 Wellington Crescent, Winnipeg, Manitoba

Oklahoma Bible Academy, Meno, Oklahoma
Western Mennonite School, Route 1, Box 626, Salem, Oregon
Meade Bible Academy, Meade, Kansas
Lustre Bible Academy, Lustre, Montana
La Junta Mennonite School of Nursing, La Junta, Colorado
Johnstown Mennonite School, Route 2, Hollsopple, Pennsylvania
Berean Bible School, 1020 S. Hall Street, Allentown, Pennsylvania
Belleville Mennonite School, Belleville, Pennsylvania
Bethel Springs School, Culp, Arkansas

For the third successive year, total attendance in Mennonite secondary schools and colleges has shown an annual decrease. In 1948-49 the total enrollment in 36 schools was 6,871. In 1951-52 the total in 39 schools was 6,328. This is a decrease of 543, even though the total number of schools has increased by 3.

The Berean Bible School, Allentown, Pennsylvania, representing the Mennonite Brethren in Christ, with an attendance of 37, is a new school, included for the first time. However, two larger schools, the Mountain View Bible School, Didsbury, Alberta, and the Mennonite Educational Institute, Abbotsford, British Columbia, are omitted for 1951-52. The Mountain View Bible School, representing the United Missionary Church, preferred not to be included in these annual reports. The Mennonite Educational Institute closed its doors, and the building in which the school had been conducted was sold, to be used as a public high school. The attendance in these two schools for 1950-51 was 389. The actual loss in 1951-52, as compared with 1950-51, was 358. The drop in attendance of Mennonite students was 227. The loss in non-Mennonite enrollment was 131.

Almost annually, since their beginning, these reports have increased in complexity and in length. The present report is shortened, in an attempt to cut down expenses, by omitting certain features which are considered less vital. Table XI as given in the latest previous reports is this time combined with Table I, without loss of information. What was formerly Table V has been left out. It was felt that, for our purposes, exact details of church membership for the 980 non-Mennonites could be omitted without undue loss. Table VII which gave states and countries in which non-Mennonite students are at home was also omitted. The summary formerly given in Table XIII, which is omitted, can be secured by studying the tables which are included.

TABLE I

tal Enrollment in Mennonite Secondary Schools and Colleges 1951-52

School			Graduate Students	College	Academy	Bible	Other Depts.	Total Enrollment
M.B.S.	40	4			44	33	11	
Goshen	43	842[1]		357	920	411	509	
E.M.C.	7	247[2]	165	214[3]	633	306	327	
Bethel, Kans.		440			440	214	226	
Hesston		153[9]	170	74[5]	397	176	221	
Grace		316			316	166	150	
Lancaster			312		312			312
Bluffton		255		53[6]	308	145	163	
Tabor	8	239		14[6]	261	122	139	
Immanuel			218		218			218
Bethel, Ind.		159		55[4]	214	113	101	
Freeman		51	104		155	81	74	
Pacific	3	146			149	79	70	
M.B.C.I.		29	99		128			128
Eden			127		127	61	66	
Iowa			118		118	54	64	
M.B.B.C.		117			117			117
M.C.I.		34	81		115	57	58	
Corn			95		95	41	54	
U.M.E.I.		17	77		94			94
Emmanuel		13	15	65[10]	93	15	13	65[8]
Rockway			91		91	35	56	
Alberta			90[11]		90	49	41	
Berean, Kans.			90		90	45	45	
Central Kans.			85		85			85
Bethel Hosp.		76			76		76	
Rosthern		30	43		73	38	35	
Steinbach			62		62	30	32	
Bloomington		61			61		61	
Canadian		60			60	32	28	
Oklahoma			58		58	23	35	
Western			58		58	30	28	
Meade			56		56			56
Lustre			46		46			46
La Junta		43			43		43	
Johnstown			39		39	15	24	
Berean, Pa.			37		37	25	12	
Belleville			33		33			33
Bethel Springs			16		16	7	9	
Totals	101	3332	2385	510	6328	2403	2771	1154

[1] This includes 188 special; 108 summer; 5 spring; 21 nursing students; 19 correspondence students.

[2] 70 college Bible students distributed as follows: seniors 9; juniors 10; sophomores 19; freshmen 22; special 9.

[3] E.M.C. Bulletin, Vol. 34, No. 4, pp. 151-63. 191 Bible students; 23 eighth-grade students.

[4] Bible students.

[5] 43 six weeks' Bible term students; 31 correspondence students.

[6] Music and art students not of college grade.

[7] 4 correspondence students not of college grade; 31 winter Bible term students for six weeks.

[8] Evening class students.

[9] Four correspondence students of college grade, included.

[10] Evening class Bible students.

[11] Ten students seem to be college freshmen.

TABLE II

Enrollment by Classes, College Students, Mennonite Secondary Schools and Colleges, 1951-52

College	Graduate Students	Seniors	Juniors	Sophomores	Freshmen	Special	Summer	Other Depts.	Spring	Total
M.B.S.	40		3			1				44
Goshen	43[10]	117	94[1]	135[2]	176[3]	188	108	19[4]	5	885
Bethel, Kans.		74	53	82	110	20	40	55[5]	6	440
Grace		52	70	53	141					316
Bluffton		44	36	60	64	23	28			255
E.M.C.	7	31[6]	26	52	82[7]	26	30			254
Tabor	8[11]	20	21	65	65	11	31	17	9	247
Bethel, Ind.	1	22	23	37	66	10				159
Hesston		5	6	30	74	3		13[8]	22	153
Pacific	3	17	21	38	60	10				149
M.B.B.C.		29	27	53		8				117[9]
Bethel Hosp.			34	22	20					76
Bloomington			13	15	33					61
Canadian		13	3	10	26	8				60
Freeman				21	30					51
La Junta			16	12	15					43
M.C.I.					34					34
Rosthern					30					30
M.B.C.I.					29					29
U.M.E.I.					17					17
Emmanuel		4	1	4	4					13
Totals	102	428	447	689	1076	308	237	104	42	3433

[1] 8 juniors in the School of Nursing.
[2] 13 sophomores in the School of Nursing.
[3] 22 freshmen in the pre-nursing course.
[4] Correspondence students.
[5] Extension students.
[6] E.M.C. Bulletin, Vol. 34, No. 4, pp. 151-63.
[7] Two "American studies" students counted as unclassified, are included.
[8] 9 evening students; 4 correspondence students.
[9] 29 seniors; 27 middlers; 53 juniors.
[10] Seminary students 32; liberal arts graduate students 11.
[11] Seminary students 7; liberal arts graduate student 1.

TABLE III

Enrollment by Classes, Students not of College Grade, Mennonite Secondary Schools and Colleges, 1951-52

School	Seniors	Juniors	Sophomores	Freshmen	Special	Bible	Other Depts.	Total
E.M.C.	62	45	12	28	18[1]	191[2]	23[3]	379
Lancaster	70	79	75	86	2			312
Hesston	72	46	27	24	1	43[3]	31[4]	244
Immanuel	53	52	55	58				218
Eden							127[7]	127
Iowa	17	37	41	23				118
Freeman	28	21	33	21	1			104
M.B.C.I.		31	44	24				99
Corn	22	31	20	22				95
Rockway	14	14	26	35	2			91
Alberta			50[10]	40[9]				90
Berean, Kans.	14	17	24	35				90
Central Kans.	10	20	25	30				85
M.C.I.		39	28	14				81
Emmanuel		7	3	4	1[1]		65	80
U.M.E.I.	7	16	22	32				77
Steinbach	4	6	20	7	25[1]			62
Oklahoma	10	16	7	25				58
Western	11	14	16	11	1		5[5]	58
Meade	9	19	9	19				56
Bethel, Ind.	2	6	10	23	14[1]			55
Bluffton							53[6]	53
Lustre	9	9	13	15				46
Rosthern		29	10	4				43
Johnstown	11	11	9	7	1			39
Berean, Pa.							37[7]	37
Goshen						31[3]	4[4]	35
Belleville	6	4	11	12				33
Bethel Springs	2	1	5	8				16
Tabor							14[8]	14
Totals	433	570	595	607	66	265	359	2895

[1] Unclassified.
[2] 119 winter Bible school students; 60 Bible correspondence; 12 Christian workers.
[3] Six weeks' Bible term.
[4] Correspondence students.
[5] Fifth-year high-school students.
[6] Music and art students not of college grade.
[7] Details not given.
[8] Eighth-grade students.
[9] Grades 7 to 9.
[10] Grades 10 to 12.

TABLE IV

Mennonite Students, 1951-52

	Goshen	E.M.C.	Hesston	Bethel, Kans.	Lancaster	Grace	Tabor	Immanuel	Bethel, Ind.	Freeman	Bluffton	M.B.C.I.	Eden	Iowa	M.B.B.C.	Pacific	M.C.I.	U.M.E.I.	Corn	Alberta	Central Kans.	Rockway	Berean, Kans.	Rosthern	Bethel Hosp.	Emmanuel	Steinbach	Canadian	Western	Oklahoma	Meade	M.B.S.	La Junta	Lustre	Johnstown	Berean, Pa.	Belleville	Bloomington	Bethel Spgs.	Total
(Old) Mennonite	611	543	261	4	312	1					1			107							17	68			10	6							41		39					2125
G.C. Menn.	32		30	321		163	9	6		123	122	4			7	4	60			3	14	1	65	68	47	2		54		55	3	43		14			33*	3	12	1260
Menn. Brethren	2		1	3		20	181	172		9		112			103	109	1	4	91	87	21	1	2	1	3				1	3			17				10		944
United Miss. (M.B.C.)	14								159							1									51									37†					262
Mennonite Unclass.	3		44								1		127*				1										1												177
Evan. Menn. Breth.	4					37	10			5		1			1						2		3			2			29			9						103
United Menn.																		88				1			1													90
Krim. Menn. Breth.			2			15	20	17		7											22			1								1						85
Conser. Amish Menn.		49												11							1	5					1											67
Kleine Gemeinde	2					2						1					1									50												56
Bergtaler Menn.	2											2					31									3	5											43
Immanuel Menn.						3																				3				19								25
Amish Menn.		10	1																						5													16
Rudnerweider												1					10									2													13
European Menn.	5						2			1	1				3																								12
Old Order Amish		9	3																																			12
Sommerfelder Menn.																	8									2													10
Ch. of God in Christ Menn.			1	2																					6													9
Evangelical Menn.	1										7																												8
Sonnenberg		8																																				8
Schœnwieser												6																										6
Swiss Menn.																							5															5
Old Order Menn.	2																1																						3
Doopsgesinde		2																																				2
Immanuel Menn. Breth.							2																															2
Old Colony										1								1																					2
Blumenorter												1																										1
Weavertown Amish		1																																				1
Wisler Menn.		1																																				1
Totals	678	623	343	330	312	241	224	195	159	146	132	128	127	118	114	114	113	93	91	90	77	76	75	69	67	65	62	60	57	56	54	43	41	41	39	37	33	13	12	5348

* Statistics not given in detail.

† Assumed that all students are members of the Mennonite Brethren in Christ Church.

TABLE V

States, Provinces, and Countries from Which Mennonite Students Come, 1951-52

	Goshen	E.M.C.	Hesston	Bethel, Kans.	Lancaster	Grace	Tabor	Immanuel	Bethel, Ind.	Freeman	Bluffton	M.B.C.I.	Eden	Iowa	M.B.B.C.	Pacific	M.C.I.	U.M.E.I.	Corn	Alberta	Central Kans.	Rockway	Berean, Kans.	Roathern	Bethel Hosp.	Emmanuel	Steinbach	Canadian	Western	Oklahoma	Meade	M.B.S.	La Junta	Lustre	Johnstown	Berean, Pa.	Belleville	Bloomington	Bethel Spgs.	Total
Penna.	102	265	3	1	296	10			3		21					1													2		5	3		37	37[2]	33	1		820
Kansas	16	1	131	230		60	112		1		1					3					71		70		42					1	51	8	6							804
Ontario	16	16		1			4		4		4		127[1]		19			90				76				64		10				2	1							434
Manitoba	5			6		8	5					124			39		110	1									62	15				3								378
Indiana	209	11	28	2		1			58		23			1											1							5						1		340
Calif.	1	1	2	6		2	11	195								65									1						4		1						289
Ohio	127	51	10	1		6			18	1	58			3																	1	5					1		282
Okla.			2	14		29	34				1					20			91		1				5				53	3									253
Virginia	4	192																																					196
Iowa	36	3	23	2		4			5		2			108											1							1	2							187
S. Dak.	2			6		26	5		6	132															3							7								187
Alberta		3		1			1		1						9		2			90				8		1		3			1								120
Sask.	1			6		3	3					1			14	4	1	2						58				22			2	2							119
Illinois	57	1	11	2							15			1											1						2	6					10		106
Michigan	26	11	3						56		2																					2					1		101
Oregon	6	1	13			12	3									11													52			2							101
Nebraska	8		15	15		19	5		5	9				2							2		4		7						3	1							95
Minnesota	7		5	15		27	6			2						1					1				1						2	1							68
Montana	1		1	4		10	2			2															1				2	2			40						65
Brit. Col.	1						8					1			23	6								3				9												51
Not given			42																																				42
Maryland	1	27			6																												2						36
New York	10	19			5	1																										1							36
N. Dak.	2		6			9	13								1																								31
Colorado	8		15	3		1	1																									1							29
Missouri	11		10											3																									24
Washington				5		7	2		1							3													1											19
Idaho	1	1	3	6		2			1												2		1																17
Arkansas			1			1																			1												10		13
Germany	4	2	1				2				1				2																								12
Florida	2	5				1																			1							1							10
Texas	3		5				1																									1							10
Canada			9[3]																																				9
Delaware	1	2			5																																		8
Paraguay							4								1										2			1												8
Puerto Rico	3	1	3																													1							8
India				1							3	2																			1								7
Other States, Provinces, and Countries	7[5]	10[6]	1[7]	3[8]		2[9]	2[10]				1[11]				6[12]																1[18]								33[4]
Totals	678	623	343	330	312	241	224	195	159	146	132	128	127	118	114	114	113	93	91	90	77	76	75	69	67	65	62	60	57	56	54	43	41	41	39	37	33	13	12	5348

(See page 338 for footnotes.)

TABLE VI

Mennonite Students of College Grade, 1951-52

School	*Men*	*Women*	*Total*
Goshen College	293	351	644[1]
Bethel College, Kansas	167	163	330
Eastern Mennonite College	115	135	250[2]
Grace Bible Institute	129	112	241
Tabor College	106	109	215[3]
Hesston College and Bible School	67	71	138
Bethel College, Indiana	59	69	128[5]
Mennonite Brethren Bible College			114[4]
Pacific Bible Institute of Fresno	62	52	114
Bluffton College	55	50	105
Bethel Deaconess School of Nursing		67	67
Freeman Junior College	25	19	44
Mennonite Biblical Seminary	32	11	43[6]
La Junta Mennonite School of Nursing		41	41
Canadian Mennonite Bible College	20	17	37
Mennonite Collegiate Institute			34[4]
Mennonite Brethren Collegiate Institute			29[4]
Rosthern Junior College	17	12	29
Emmanuel Bible College	10	7	17
United Mennonite Educational Institute	9	8	17
Bloomington Mennonite School of Nursing		13	13
Total	1166	1307	2650[7]
			2473[8]

[1] 16 graduate students; 628 undergraduates.
[2] 7 graduate students; 243 on the college level.
[3] 11 graduate students; 204 on the college level.
[4] Details not given.
[5] 1 graduate student; 127 on the college level.
[6] 39 graduate students; 4 on the college level.
[7] Vertical total.
[8] Horizontal total.

(Footnotes for Table V.)

[1] Assumed that all Mennonite students were from Ontario. [2] Assumed that all were Mennonite Brethren in Christ students from Pa. [3] From Canada. No province named in the report. [4] From other states, provinces, and countries. [5] 2 from Miss.; one each from Netherlands, Argentina, District of Columbia, France, Georgia. [6] 5 from West Virginia; 2 from Arizona; one each from Netherlands, North Carolina, Louisiana. [7] One from Alabama. [8] 2 from Java; one from Arizona. [9] 2 from North Carolina. [10] 2 from Brazil. [11] One from Belgian Congo. [12] 3 from Switzerland; 2 from Netherlands; one from Japan. [13] One from Paraguay.

TABLE VII

Mennonite Students Not of College Grade, 1951-52

School	*Men*	*Women*	*Total*
Eastern Mennonite College	184	189	373
Lancaster Mennonite School			312[1]
Hesston College and Bible School	92	113	205
Immanuel Academy			195[1]
Eden Bible and High School	61	66	127
Iowa Mennonite School	54	64	118
Freeman Junior College	51	51	102
Mennonite Brethren Collegiate Institute			99[1]
Corn Bible Academy	39	52	91
Alberta Mennonite High School	49	41	90
Mennonite Collegiate Institute			79[1]
Central Kansas Bible Academy			77[1]
Rockway Mennonite School	28	48	76
United Mennonite Educational Institute			76[1]
Berean Academy, Kansas	40	35	75
Steinbach Bible Academy	30	32	62
Western Mennonite School	30	27	57
Oklahoma Bible Academy	22	34	56
Meade Bible Academy			54[1]
Emmanuel Bible College	4	2	48[2]
Lustre Bible Academy			41[1]
Rosthern Junior College	18	22	40
Johnstown Mennonite School	15	24	39
Berean Bible School, Pennsylvania	25	12	37
Goshen College	25	9	34
Belleville Mennonite School			33[1]
Bethel College, Indiana	20	11	31
Bluffton College	5	22	27
Canadian Mennonite Bible College	12	11	23
Bethel Springs School	4	8	12
Tabor College	1	8	9
Totals	809	881	2698[3]
			1690[4]

[1] Details not given.

[2] Details not given for 42 evening class students.

[3] Vertical totals.

[4] Horizontal totals.

TABLE VIII

Students in Summer Session, 1951

School	*Men*	*Women*	*Total*
Goshen College	79	169	248
Bethel College, Kansas	35	68	103
Bluffton College	26	51	77
Tabor College	13	46	59
Bethel College, Indiana	34	17	51
Eastern Mennonite College	16	26	42
Hesston College and Bible School	6	18	24
Pacific Bible Institute of Fresno	6	3	9
Total	215	398	613[1]

[1] This number includes duplicates with the regular school year.

TABLE IX

Diplomas Given and Degrees Granted, 1951

	M.B.S.	Goshen	Bethel, Kansas	Bluffton	Tabor	E.M.C.	Grace	Bethel, Indiana	M.B.B.C.	Pacific	Canadian	Hesston	Bethel Hosp.	La Junta	Bloomington	Emmanuel	Freeman	H. S. Diplomas	Total
B.D.	4	1	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
M.R.E.	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Th.B.	..	15	..	..	..	4	..	..	7	3	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	30
B.A.	..	91	41	19	34	5	..	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	198
B.S. in Ed.	..	51	11	7	..	9	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	78
B.A. Bibl.	..	..	9	..	..	9	21	15	..	7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	61
B.R.E.	..	3	..	..	..	5	..	..	12	..	8	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	34
B.S.	..	..	..	18	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	18
B.S. Nurs.	..	8	4	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	14
B.S. Biol.	..	..	7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7
B.A. Anthr.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
B. SchMus.	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
B.S. Bus.	..	..	1	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
B.S. HoEc.	..	..	2	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
B.S. NaSc.	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
B.S. IndArts	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
B.A. SecEd.	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
B.A. ChrEd.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
R.N.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	21	16	13	..	..	..	50
Bibl. 3 yr.	1	..	..	..	..	..	31	1	1	5	4	..	..	..	..	4	..	..	47
A.A.	..	16	6	..	4	..	..	..	..	5	..	28	..	..	..	..	4	..	63
Jr. Col. Bibl.	..	..	..	..	..	9	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	9
Jr. Col.	..	..	..	..	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
Bibl. 2 yr.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
Normal 2 yr.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	..	4
A.A. Bibl.	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
Theol.	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Normal 1 yr.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	15	..	15
Chr. Workers	..	4	..	..	..	7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	11
Sec. 1 yr.	..	4	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	7
Am. Studies	..	4	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	7
Music	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Acad. or H.S. diplomas	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	334	334[3]
Totals	7	198	86[1]	50[2]	41	62	52	24	22	31[1]	13	36	21	16	13	4	26	334	1036

[1] 1952 graduates.
[2] Bluffton College Bulletin, April 1952, p. 51.
[3] 334 high-school diplomas as follows: E.M.C. 65; Hesston 70; Freeman 21; Rosthern 30; Meade 9; Berean, Kans. 14; Lustre 8; Rockway 16; Johnstown 11; Western 16; Bethel Springs 1; Immanuel 53; Cent. Kans. 10; Oklahoma 10.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND RESEARCH NOTES

A Guide to Maps
In
Mennonite Books And Periodicals

Although maps have appeared in Mennonite books and periodicals for many years, no bibliography on Mennonite history and life has ever included a wide collection of these aids. The list below is introductory and should be followed by a more exhaustive bibliography in a future issue of the Review. Periodicals were searched for maps only from 1940 on, and only the more widely circulated papers easily accessible in Mennonite college libraries have been included. The bibliography gives the subjects of the maps and not the exact titles appearing on them. Maps which will appear in the first two volumes of the forthcoming *Mennonite Encyclopedia* are also listed. The following abbreviations are used in the bibliography.

MM—*Missionary Messenger*
The Menn.—*The Mennonite*
GCM—General Conference Mennonite
ME—*Mennonite Encyclopedia*
ML—*Mennonite Life*
M Lex.—*Mennonitisches Lexikon*
BMCAR—*Mennonite Board of Missions and Charities Annual Report*
MQR—*Mennonite Quarterly Review*
Der Menn.—*Der Mennonit*
Menn. C—*Mennonite Community*
MWR—*Mennonite Weekly Review*

AFRICA

Mennonite Missions in the Congo: *ME* I.
Mennonite Missions in Africa: *ME* I.
Missions in Africa: *Der Menn.*, Oct. 1950, 102.
Menn. Mission Fields in Africa: E. G. Kaufman, *The Development of the Missionary and Philanthropic Interest Among the Mennonites of North America* (Berne, Ind., 1931), 315.
Musoma District-Tanganyika Territory: *MM*, Aug. 12, 1945, back cover.
Mennonite Missions in East Africa: *MM*, Dec. 1952, 9.
Africa: W. B. Weaver, *Thirty Five Years in the Congo* (Chicago, 1945), 4.
Congo Inland Mission Territory: *ibid.*, 74.

ASIA

1. *China*
Mennonite Missions in China: *ME* I.
China Mission Field: *The Menn.*, Jan. 10, 1950, 24 f.
GCM Mission in Chihli Province, North China: Kaufman, *op. cit.* (Berne, Ind., 1931), 378.
Menn. Mission Fields in China: *ibid.*, 314.
Hochwan Field: J. D. Graber, *We Enter China* (Nappanee, 1947), 2.
Szechwan, Mennonite mission in: D. S. McCammon, *We Tried to Stay* (Scottdale, 1953), xvi.

2. *Central Asia*
   Central Asia: *ME* I.
3. *India*
   Sketch of Jagdeesphur, India: *The Menn.*, Nov. 26, 1946, 5.
   Central Provinces, India: *The Menn.*, Feb. 4, 1947, 1.
   Mennonite Missions in India: *ME* II.
   Mennonite Mission Fields in India: *ML*, July 1950, XII.
   India: *ML*, July 1950, 2.
   Menn. Mission Field in India (old Menn.), Kaufman, *op. cit.* (Berne, Ind., 1931), 391.
   Menn. Mission Fields in India: *ibid.*, 314.
   Field of the American Mennonite Mission in India. G. J. Lapp, *Our Mission in India* (Scottdale, 1921), 17.
   Vicinity of Dhamtari, C.P., M. C. Lehman, *Our Mission Work in India* (Elkhart, 1939), 14.
   GCM Mission in India: Mrs. H. Ratzlaff, *Fellowship in the Gospel. India 1900-1950* (Newton, 1950), 10.
   Six GCM Churches in Jagdeeshpur, India, Area: Mrs. H. Ratzlaff, *op. cit.*, 98-99.
   GCM Mission Field in India: Kaufman, *op. cit.*, 159.
   India: *Building on the Rock* (Scottdale, 1926), 199.
   India Mission Field of the Mennonite Church: *ibid.*, 188.
   India: *BMCAR*, 1915, 91.
   Field of the American Mennonite Missions in India: *ibid.*, 1922, 50.
   Sketch of Balodgahan, India, Mission Property: *ibid.*, 1931, 50.
   Sketch of Medical Station Near Dhamtari: *ibid.*, 1932, 104.
   Sketch of Sundarganj and Surroundings: *ibid.*, 1932, 113.
   Sketch of Dondi Station: *ibid.*, 1932, 117.
   Sketch of Sankra Station: *ibid.*, 1932, 128.
   Sketch of Ghatula: *ibid.*, 1932, 119.
   Sketch of Mohadi Mission Station: *ibid.*, 1932, 122.
   Sketch of Leper Asylum and Surroundings: *ibid.*, 1932, 130.
   Bihar Mennonite Mission Field: *ibid.*, 1947, 37.
   Mennonite Brethren Mission Field in India: J. H. Lohrenz, *What Hath God Wrought* (Hillsboro, 1949), 32.
4. *Japan*
   Mennonite Missions in Japan: *ME* II.
   Japan: *Der Menn.*, Oct. 1950, 105.
   Japan Mission Field (GCM): *The Menn.*, Jan. 15, 1952, 41.
   GCM Mission Field on Kyushu Island, Japan: *The Menn.*, Sept. 23, 1952, 598.
   Japan: *The Menn.*, Feb. 3, 1953, cover.
   Japan: *BMCAR*, 1951, 49.
5. *Java*
   Java Mission Field: *ME* II.
   Java Mission Field: *M Lex.*, 395.
   Mennonite Mission Field in Java: *ML*, Jan. 1948, 18.
   Java and Sumatra Missions: *Christ Seul* (March 1933), 6-7.
   Java Mennonite Missions: *Christ Seul* (April 1951), xi.
6. *New Guinea*
   New Guinea Mission Field: *Christ Seul*, (April 1951), 10.

EUROPE

1. ***Continent***
   MCC Activity Centers in Europe, 1950: *ML*, Oct. 1951, 23.
   German Settlements in the Black Sea Region: J. J. Hildebrand, *Zeittafel* (Winnipeg, 1954), insert.
   General Area of the Proposed Mission in Europe: *MM*, May 1950, front cover
   From the Vistula River to the Dnieper River: *ML*, Oct. 1951, 17.
   Mennonite Colonies in Europe. T. O. Hylkema, *De geschiedenis van De Doopsgezinde Gemeenten in Rusland . . . 1914 tot 1920* (Steenwijk, 1920 ?), 23.
   Mennonite Landmarks in Western Europe: ML, July 1952, 103.
   Secluded churches in the Holy Roman Empire: Stephan Hirzel, *Heimliche Kirche*, (Hamburg, 1952,)
2. ***Austria***
   Austria: *ME* I.
3. ***Belgium***
   Belgium: *ME* I.
   Luxembourg: *Christian Monitor*, Jan. 1953, 19.
4. ***France***
   France: *ME* II.
   Alsace, Upper: *ME* I.
   Mennonite congregations in France: ML, July 1952, 104.
5. ***Germany***
   Germany: *ME* II.
   The Territory of the City of Kulm: Herbert Wiebe, *Das Siedlungswerk niederlandischer Mennoniten im Weichseltal zwischen Fordon und Weissenberg bis zum Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Marburg a.d. Lahn, 1952), opposite 32.
   Mennonite Zones in Germany: *Der Menn.*, April 1951, 60.
   Mennonites in West Germany: *Der Menn.*, July 1951, 108.
   Menn. Churches in South Germany: *ML*, Jan. 1947, 14.
   Vistula Delta: Hildebrand, *op. cit.*, 65.
   Germany, Language Map: Hildebrand, *op. cit., 68.*
6. *Holland*
   Friesland, Mennonite churches in: ME II.
   Friesland, Mennonite churches in: *M Lex.*, 10.
   Province of Friesland: Steven Blaupot ten Cate, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Friesland* (W. Eekhoff, 1839), end of book.
   Southwest Peninsula of Friesland: H. Bakels, *Het Volk von Menno* (Leiden, 1908), 2.
   Groningen, Mennonite churches in: *ME* II.
   Groningen, Mennonite churches in: *M Lex.*, 180.
   Outline map of Groningen and East Friesland, indicating the existing, extinct, and combined congregations in 1842: S. Blaupot ten Cate, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Groningen, Overijssel en Oost-Friesland.* (Leeuwarden, 1842), inside back cover.
   Holland: *Der Menn.*, Feb. 1952, 26.
   Holland: Steven Blaupot ten Cate: *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht en Gelderland* (Amsterdam, 1847), 400.
   The Mennonites in the Netherlands: *ML*, Jan. 1946, 30.
   Groningen and East Friesland: Hildebrand, *op. cit.*, 63.
   North Holland Province: *M Lex.*, 273.

West Friesland; Hildebrand, *op. cit.*, 64.
Friesland Province: Hildebrand, *op. cit.*, 61.

7. *Moravia*

Hutterian Settlements in Moravia and Hungary (now Czechoslovakia): John Horsch, *The Hutterian Brethren* (Scottdale, 1931), 160.
Moravia and Adjoining Provinces: Horsch, *op. cit.*, 161.
Most important settlements of the Hutterian Brethren in what was then Moravia and Hungary: Lydia Müller, *Der Kommunismus der mährischen Wiedertäufer.* (Leipzig, 1927), p. 128.

8. *Poland*

Danzig, Mennonite Churches in Free City of: *ME* II.
The Political Districts of the Vistula Valley Between Sartowitz and Neuenburg About 1700 Wiebe, *op. cit.*, opposite 108.
The Lower Valley of the Vistula: Wiebe, *op. cit.*, opposite 2.
Danzig and Surrounding Areas: *The Menn.*, March 2, 1945, 7.
Mennonite Churches in Free City of Danzig: *M Lex.*, 391.
Danzig and Surrounding Territory: *ML*, April 1948, 11.
Original and Daughter Settlements of the Galician Mennonites: *Der Menn.*, Nov.-Dec. 1949, 95.
Menn. Settlements in Poland: MWR, Dec. 14, 1950, 7.
Sketch of the regions of the "Breiten Wiese" and the Ellernwald in the Holland district of Prussia, 1556-1558: Bruno Schumacher, *Niederländische Ansiedlungen im Herzogtum Preussen zur Zeit Herzog Albrechts (1525-1568)* (Leipzig, 1903), 207.
Dutch settlements in the Holland district of Prussia, 1527-1560: *ibid.*, 206.

9. *Russia*

Alexandertal (Samara): *ME* I.
Alexandertal (Samara): *M Lex.*, 22.
Bachmut: *ME* I.
Barnaul Mennonite Settlement: Hildebrand, *op. cit.*, 277.
Barnaul Settlement: *ME* I.
Barnaul Settlement: *M Lex.*, 126.
Caucasus Region: *ME* I.
Chortitza: *ME* I.
The Chortitza Settlement: D. G. Rempel, The Mennonite Colonies in New Russia (1933 unpublished thesis), insert 68.
The Memrik Settlement: Rempel, *op. cit.*, insert 177.
The Mennonite Village of Rosenthal near Chortitza: *Der Menn.*, 1951, 137.
Mennonite Settlements in the Ukraine: *ML*, April 1947, 21.
Molotschna River Area: D. Ysenbeek, *Bijdragen tot de Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden* (P. J. Persijn, 1848), end of book.
Mennonite colonies along the Molotschna River in 1806: Freiherrn von Reiswitz, *Beitrage zur Kenntnisz der Mennoniten-Gemeinden in Europa und America* (Berlin, 1821), 401.
Molotschna Colony: *M Lex.*, 155.
Molotschna Mennonites 1852: Hildebrand, *op. cit.*, insert.
The German Mennonite Colonies in Russia: Hildebrand, *op. cit.*, insert.
The Molotschna Settlements of Mennonites in Russia: Hildebrand, *op. cit.*, 26.
The Molotschna Settlement: Rempel, *op. cit.*, insert 84.

The Colonies in New Russia: Remple, *op. cit.,* insert 29.
Molotschna Mennonite Districts of Halbstadt and Gnadenfeld: Jacob Quiring, *Die Mundart von Chortitza in Süd-Russland* (München, 1928), insert.
Molotschna Mennonite Districts According to Kippenmayer, 1852: Franz Izaak, *Die Molotschnaer Mennoniten* (Halbstadt, 1908), insert 1.
Chortitza and Molotschna Settlements and the Daughter Colonies in South Russia: Hildebrand, *op. cit.,* 163.
Most Important Mennonite Settlements in European Russia: Rempel, *op. cit.,* insert 192
Mennonite Colonies in Russia: Paul Langhans, "Der heutige Stand der Siedlungsthätigkeit deutscher Mennoniten in Südrussland," in *Petermanns Geographische Mitteilungen* (1898), Heft VIII, 174-78.
The Home of the German Mennonites of South Russia: T. O. Hylkema, *Die Mennoniten-Gemeinden in Russland . . . 1914-1920* (Heilbronn, 1921), 115.
Mennonite Colonies in the Ukraine, 1914: T. O. Hylkema, *De geschiedenis van de Doopsgezinde gemeenten in Russland . . . 1914-1920* (Steenwijk, 1921), back cover.
Hutterites in South Russia: A. J. F. Zieglschmid, *Das Klein Geschichtsbuch der Hutterischen Brüder* (Philadelphia, 1947), 781.
The German Mennonite Colonies in Russia: Quiring, *op. cit.,* insert.
The Memrik Mennonite Settlement: D. H. Epp, *Die Memriker Ansiedlung* (Berdyansk, 1910).
Mennonite Settlements in West Siberia: K. Beil, *Die Mennoniten-Gemeinden in Russland* (Heilbronn, 1921), insert.
Mennonite Settlements in Russia: K. Beil, *op. cit.,* insert.
Mennonite Settlements in Ukraine, Russia: K. Beil, *op. cit.,* insert.
Mennonite Colonies in the Ukraine 1914: T. O. Hylkema, *De geschiedenis van De Doopsgezinde Gemeenten in Rusland . . . 1914 tot 1920* (Steenwijk, 1921), 21.
Orenburg Mennonite Settlement, Russia: P. J. Dyck, *Orenburg am Ural* (Clearbrook, B. C., 1951), 21.
Trakt Mennonite Settlement, Samara, Russia: J. J. Dyck, *Am Trakt?*
The Terek Mennonite Settlement: C. P. Toews, *Die Tereker Ansiedlung* (Rosthern, 1945),—.
The Volga German Colonies: Rempel, *op. cit.,* insert 14.

10. *Switzerland*

Bern Canton: *ME* I.
Canton of Bern: *M Lex.,* 194.
Canton of Bern: D. Gratz, *Bernese Anabaptists* (Scottdale, 1953), 186.
Emmental: *ME* II.
Emmental: *M Lex.,* 579.
Switzerland: *Menn. C,* March 1951, 18 f.

NORTH AMERICA

1. *Alaska*

Alaska: *Menn. C,* July 1951, 6.

2. *Canada*

NATIONAL

Canada (All Mennonites): *ME* I.
Canadian Alternative Service Camps: *ME* I.

Northwest Territory and Canada: *ML,* April 1948, 5.
Foreign Groups in Canada, 1929 (including Mennonites): C. A. Dawson, *Group Settlement Ethnic Communities in Western Canada* (Toronto, 1936), IV.
Canadian Rural Population of Dutch Origin, 1921 (mostly Mennonites): Dawson, *op. cit.,* 101.

PROVINCES

a. *Ontario*
Mennonites in Welland Co., Ont.: *MQR* XXVII, 56.
Woolwich Township, Ontario: L. J. Burkholder, *A Brief History of the Mennonites in Ontario* (Toronto, 1935), 42.
Mennonite Settlements in Ontario: Burkholder, *op. cit.,* 30.
Mennonite Settlements in Haldimand and Welland Counties, Ont.: L. J. Burkholder, *op. cit.,* 44.
Churches in Vaughan, Markham, and Pickering, Ontario: L. J. Burkholder, *op. cit.,* 108.
Churches of the Waterloo District, Ont.: Burkholder, *op. cit.,* 63.
Congregations in York County and District, Ont.: Burkholder, *op. cit.,* 108.
Township map of Ontario showing Mennonite settlements: Burkholder, *op. cit.,* 30
Places of Worship of United Mennonites in Ontario: *The Menn.,* June 8, 1948, 19.
Pioneer map of Waterloo County, Ont.: *Menn. C,* Sept. 1948, 20

b. *Manitoba*
East Reserve, Manitoba: *ME* II.
Flood Area in Manitoba: *Der Menn.,* Aug. 1950, 70.
Manitoba Hutterites: A. J. F. Zieglschmid, *op. cit.* (Philadelphia, 1947), 777.
West Reserve, Manitoba: *ML,* April 1949, 21.
West Reserve, Manitoba: *MWR,* April 5, 1951, 11.
Mennonite West Reserve, Manitoba: C. A. Dawson, *op. cit.,* 108.
Mennonite West Reserve Village Settlement: C. A. Dawson, *op. cit.,* 116.
Sketch of Winkler, Manitoba: C. A. Dawson, *op. cit.,* 163.
Red River Plains: *ML,* July 1948, 24 f.
Red River Plains Region: *ML,* April 1951, 13.
Mennonite Churches in Manitoba: *M Lex.,* 15.

c. *Saskatchewan*
Saskatchewan: *The Menn.,* Sept. 30, 1947, 6.

d. *Alberta*
Alberta, Mennonite Churches in: *ME* I.
Alberta Hutterites: A. J. F. Zieglschmid, *op. cit.,* 779.

e. *British Columbia*
British Columbia, Mennonite Churches in: *ME* I.
British Columbia, Alberta, and Sask.: *Menn. C,* May 1949, 18.
Mennonite Settlements in British Columbia: *ML,* July 1946, 12.
Frazer River Valley: *ME* II:

3. *Mexico*
Mennonite Colony in Mexico: *M Lex.,* 121.
Mennonite colony in Cuauhtemoc, Chih., Mex.: *ML,* April 1947, 28.
Northern and Central Mexico: MWR, July 2, 1953, 10.
Mennonite Colonists in Cuauhtemoc, Chih., Mexico; Walter Schmiedehaus, *Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott* (Cuauhtemoc, 1948), 150.

4. *Puerto Rico*

Puerto Rico: *Menn. C,* July 1948, 16.

Puerto Rico: J. G. Holsinger, *Serving Rural Puerto Rico* (Scottdale, 1952), 195.

5. *United States*

NATIONAL

Amish Settlements, U.S.: *ME* I.

Civilian Public Service Camps: *ME* I.

Conservative Amish Mennonite Congregations: *ME* I.

Distribution of All Branches of Mennonites in U.S. and Canada: C. H. Smith, *The Mennonites* (Berne, 1920), 250.

Mennonite Churches in U.S. and Canada: L. J. Heatwole, *Mennonite Handbotok of Information* (Scottdale, 1925), 56.

Mennonite CPS Camps and Units: Melvin Gingerich, *Service for Peace* (Scottdale, 1949), end sheets.

Mennonite CPS Camps and Units: *The Menn.,* July 25, 1944, 4.

GCM Congregations: *ML,* July 1947, 41.

All Mennonites of North Amercia: *ML,* July 1947, 41.

Mennonite Institutions in America, 1928: Kaufman, *op. cit.,* 320.

Distribution of all Branches of Mennonites in North America: Kaufman, *op. cit.,* 32.

Old Order Amish Mennonite Communities: J. A. Hostetler, *Annotated Bibliography on the Amish* (Scottdale, 1951), xiv.

Origins of the Mennonite Brethren in Christ: J. A. Huffman, *History of the Mennonite Brethren in Christ Church* (New Carlisle, 1920), 282.

REGIONAL

The Southern U.S.: *Menn. C,* June 1952, 24.

Churches in the Shenandoah Valley and Mountains of Va. and W. Va.: *Menn. C,* Sept. 1949, 19.

Bible School and Church Locations in Escambia, Monroe, Conecuh Co., Ala. and Escambia, Santa Rosa, and Okaloosa Co., Fla.: *MM,* June 1952, 5.

Alabama-Florida Mission Field: *MM,* Nov. 12, 1944, back cover.

GCM Mission Fields Among the American Indians in Okla., Ariz., and Mont.: *The Menn.,* April 19, 1949, 5.

GCM Mission Fields Among the American Indians in Okla., Ariz., and Mont.: Kaufman, *op. cit.,* 151.

Oregon-Washington GCM Churches: *The Menn.,* July 14, 1953, 421.

Indiana and Western Ohio: *ML,* July 1947,18.

STATES

a. *Arizona*

GCM Missions in Arizona: *The Menn.,* Sept. 30, 1952, 614.

b. *California*

California, Mennonite Churches in: *ME* I.

c. *Idaho*

Idaho: *Menn. C,* April 1949, 16.

d. *Illinois*

Chicago, Mennonite Churches in: *ME* I.

Illinois, Mennonite Churches in: *ME* II.

Mennonite Churches in a 200 mi. Radius from Chicago: *The Menn.,* Nov. 20, 1945, 13.

Mennonite Churches and Missions in Chicago: *The Menn.,* Feb. 27, 1945, 7.

Chicago: *ML,* April 1953, 53.

Mennonite Congregations and Institutions in Illinois, 1926: H. F. Weber, *Centennial History of the Mennonites of Illinois* (Scottdale, 1931), 640 insert.
Mennonite Congregations and Institutions of Central Illinois: Weber, *op. cit.*, insert 640.

e. *Indiana*
Old Order Amish Districts of Indiana: L. D. Christner, *Old Order Amish Church Districts of Indiana* (Topeka, Ind., 1949).
Territory Around Berne, Ind.: *The Menn.,* July 8, 1947, 7.
Elkhart-Lagrange Co., Ind.: *ME* II.
Indiana, Mennonite Churches in: *ME* II.

f. *Iowa*
Johnson-Washington Co., Iowa: *ME* II.
Iowa, Mennonite Churches in: *ME* II.

g. *Kansas*
Mennonite Churches in Kansas: *The Menn.,* May 22, 1945, 4.
Kanopolis Dam and Reservoir in Ellsworth Co., Kan.: *The Menn.,* March 4, 1947, 11.
Amish and Old Mennonite Communities, Reno Co., Kan.: *ML,* April 1951, 21.
Alexanderwohl Villages in Kansas, 1874: *ML,* Oct. 1949, 21 f.
Harvey Co., Kan.: *ME* II.
Kansas, Mennonite Churches in: *ME* II.

h. *Maryland*
Maryland: *Menn. C,* May 1951, 6.

i. *Michigan*
Missions in Upper Peninsula of Michigan: *Christian Monitor,* March 1947, 79.

j. *Minnesota*
Cottonwood Co., Minn.: *ME* I.
Mt. Lake Mennonite Settlement 1937: F. P. Schultz, *The Settlement of German Mennonites from Russia at Mt. Lake, Minn.* (Univ. of Minn., Minneapolis, 1938), 106.

k. *North Dakota*
The Portion of N. Dakota Examined by Mennonite Committee: *MQR* V, 220.

l. *Ohio*
Allen Co., Ohio, Mennonite Churches in: *ME* I.
Holmes Co., Ohio, Mennonite Churches in: *ME* II.
Churches in Mahoning and Columbiana Co., Ohio: J. S. Umble, *Ohio Mennonite Sunday Schools* (Scottdale, 1941), 358.
Churches in Medina, Portage, Wayne, Stark, Holmes, and Tuscarawas Co., Ohio: Umble, *op. cit.,* 208.
Churches in Putman, Allen, and Hancock Co., Ohio: Umble, *op. cit.,* 164.
Amish and Mennonite Churches in Ohio: Umble, *op. cit.,* inside cover.
Churches in Logan, Champaign, Clark, and Madison Co., Ohio: Umble, *op. cit.,* 106.
Old Order Amish Settlements and Districts in Ohio (44 maps): H. N. Troyer, *Ohio Amish Directory* (Millersburg, Ohio, 1940).

m. *Oregon*
Oregon: *Menn. C,* Feb. 1949, 19.

n. *Pennsylvania*
Amish and Old Order Mennonite Communities of Lancaster Co., and

Adjacent Territory: Walter M. Kollmorgen, *Culture of a Contemporary Rural Community* (Washington, 1942), 2.
Lancaster Co.: *M Lex.*, 395.
Lancaster Co.: *ME* II.
Bucks-Montgomery Co., Pa., Mennonite Churches in: *ME* I.
Lancaster Co.: *MM*, Feb. 1947, 7.
Outpost Summer Bible Schools in Northern Pa.: *MM*, Aug. 1951, front cover.
Swamp Mennonite District of Bucks Co.: *ML*, Oct. 1947, 33.
Montgomery Co.: *M Lex.*, 165.
Mennonites of Jacobs Creek Settlement, Westmoreland and Fayette Counties, Pa.: Edward Yoder, *The Mennonites of Westmoreland Co., Pa.* (Scottdale, 1942), 61.
Meetinghouses Erected by the Franconia Conference Mennonites: John C. Wenger, *History of the Mennonites of the Franconia Conference* (Scottdale, 1938), 8-9.
Philadelphia-Old and New: *Christian Monitor*, Jan. 1945, 5.
Roads Leading to Souderton: *The Menn.*, Aug. 5, 1941, 14.
Eastern District Mennonite Congregations of Eastern Pa.: *ML*, July 1947, 26.
Meetinghouses Erected by the Franconia Conference Mennonites: J. C. Wenger, *History of the Mennonites of the Franconia Conference* (Telford, 1937), 8 f.
Lancaster Conference Churches: I. D. Landis, *Missionary Movement Among Lancaster Mennonites* (Scottdale, 1938), 60 f.
Weaverland, Pa.: M. G. Weaver, *Weaverland* (New Holland, 1933), 6.

o. *South Dakota*
S. Dakota Mennonite Communities: *The Menn.*, Aug. 1, 1950, 509.
South Dakota Hutterites: Zieglschmid, *op. cit.*, 775.

SOUTH AMERICA

1. *Continental and Regional*
Mennonite Mission Fields in S. America: Kaufman, *op cit.* (Berne, Ind., 1931), 315.
Mennonite Settlements in S. America: *The Menn.*, Jan. 24, 1950, 56 f.
Our S. America Mission Field: *BMCAR*, 1928, opposite 1.
Mennonite Settlements in S. America: *ML*, Jan. 1950, 39.
Mennonite Settlements in S. America: *The Menn.*, March 4, 1947, 2.
Location of Mennonite Settlements in Brazil and Paraguay: *ML*, Jan. 1947, 36.
Mennonite Settlements in Brazil, Uruguay, and Paraguay: J. W. Fretz, *Pilgrims in Paraguay* (Scottdale, 1953), 32.
Mennonite Settlements in Paraguay and Brazil: *The Menn.*, March 4, 1947, 2.

2. *Argentina*
Argentina, Mennonite Churches in: *ME* I.
Field of Argentina Mennonite Mission: *The Gospel Under the Southern Cross* (Scottdale, 1943), inside front cover.
Argentina: *ibid.*, 16.
Mennonite Missions in Argentina: *MM*, Aug. 8, 1943, 15.
Tres Lomas District: *BMCAR*, 1934, 141.
Trenque Lauquen District: *ibid.*, 1934, 138.
Pehuajo District: *ibid.*, 1934, 141.
America District: *ibid.*, 1934, 140.

Bragado District: *ibid.*, 1934, 140.
Santa Rosa District: *ibid.*, 1934, 139.
Carlos Casares District: *ibid.*, 1934, 138.
Chaco Indian Mission: *ibid.*, 1946, 128.
Argentine Mennonite Mission: *ibid.*, 1939, 117.
Argentine Republic: *ibid.*, 1922.

3. *Brazil*
Brazil, Mennonite Settlements in: *ME* I.

4. *Paraguay*
Chaco (Mennonite Colonies): *ME* I.
Filadelfia (Fernheim, Chaco, Paraguay) Village Plan and Land Use: Annemarie E. Krause, *Mennonite Settlements in the Paraguayan Chaco* (Chicago, 1942), pocket.
Mennonite Colonies in the Chaco: Krause, *op. cit.*, pocket.
Mennonite Colony in the Chaco: *M Lex.*, 91.
Land Use, Lichtfeld, Village #1, Fernheim: Krause, *op. cit.*, pocket.
Volendam Colony: *Der Menn.*, Mar.-Apr. 1950, 32.
Paraguay Mennonite Colonies: *Der Menn.*, Mar.-Apr. 1950, 21.
Mennonite Colonies in Paraguay: J. W. Fretz, *op. cit.*, 32.
Volendam Colony, Paraguay: *Menn. C*, Dec. 1949, 20.

5. *Uruguay*
Uruguay: *Der Menn.*, Feb. 1952, 22.
Uruguay: *Der Menn.*, Jan.-Feb. 1949, 13.
El Ombu: *Der Menn.*, Aug. 1950, 77.
Sketch of El Ombu; Mennonite Settlement, Uruguay: *Mennonitische Gemeinde-Kalender*, 1952, 60.

MISCELLANEOUS

American and European Hutterites: *ME* II.
Gen. Conf. (U.S. and Canada): *ME* II.
Church of God in Christ, Mennonite Churches: *ME* I.
Hutterite Colonies in Canada and U.S.: *MQR* XXV, 64 f.
Journeys of Menno Simons: H. Bakels, *Het Volk von Menno* (Leiden, 1908), 104.
From the U.S.S.R. to the Chaco: *ML*, Jan. 1949, 16.
MCC Relief Units: J. D. Unruh, *In the Name of Christ* (Scottdale, 1952), inside cover.
Mennonite Migration: World War II: *ML*, Jan. 1949, 27.
Mennonite Migration: World War II: *ML*, Jan. 1950, 24.
Mennonite Migration: 1923-30: *ML*, Jan. 1950, 16.
Mennonite Migration: 1874-84: *ML*, Jan. 1950, 7.
Migrations of Mennonites (6 charts): *Mennonite Migration Charts* (North Newton, 1952).
Mennonite Central Committee Relief Units: J. D. Unruh, *In the Name of Christ* (Scottdale, 1952), inside cover.
Mennonite World Migration: J. John Friesen, *An Outline of Mennonite History* (Newton, 1944), 10.
Migrations of the Alexanderwohl Church: *ML*, Oct. 1949, 24.
From Prussia to Russia: *ML*, July 1948, 23.
Location of Oraibi, A Hopi Village: *The Menn.*, Dec. 15, 1942, 3.
Route Followed by Paul and Lorenz Tschetter in 1873 in Their Travels Through America: *MQR* V, 219.
The Migrations of the Galician Mennonites: *Der Menn.*, Sept.-Oct. 1949, 75.

—*Melvin Gingerich*

BOOK REVIEWS

Conscription of Conscience: The American State and the Conscientious Objector, 1940-1947. By Mulford Q. Sibley and Philip E. Jacob. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1952. Pp. xii, 580. $4.50.

Mennonite authors in writing the recent wartime history of their church see the conscription-CPS experience from the Mennonite point of view. For them the typical CO is a Biblical nonresistant whose primary concern is the way of discipleship, following the steps of Christ, his will in conformity to the will of God. These books[1] make constant reference to Brethren, Quaker, and Government CPS camps; to the various types of CO's, religious and otherwise; to CO's in prison, and kindred topics. Entire chapters deal with the coming of conscription in 1940; the Selective Service System and the operation of the draft machinery; and the organization of CPS and its operations. Since these are histories of Mennonite Civilian Public Service, however, the Mennonite point of view and the Mennonite phase of the story constitute the center of the picture. Since Mennonites are the oldest historic peace church; since about 40 per cent of all men in CPS were Mennonites; and since more men were found in Mennonite camps than in those under any other administration, these histories of Mennonite conscientious objection are quite in order. A similar contribution is made in a recent book giving the story of Brethren CPS.[2]

Conscription of Conscience, on the other hand, gives the over-all story of conscription and the CO in World War II as seen through the eyes of authors whose primary interest is that of civil liberties. In fact, this scholarly study was done with the help of a Rockefeller grant to Cornell University "for making studies which record our management of civil liberties during World War II." Chapter II, "The Community of Conscientious Objectors," classifies CO's into 8 groups: (1) the Mennonites; (2) the Brethren; (3) the Quakers; (4) other Protestants; (5) Roman Catholics; (6) Jehovah's Witnesses; (7) minor religious groups; (8) philosophical and political objectors. While the analysis of the Mennonite view and that of the other peace churches, with respect to war, peace, conscription, and military service, is fairly accurate, and the role of these three groups in the conscription-CPS story is fairly treated, the "civil liberties" orientation of the study results in a book necessarily quite different from any of the titles referred to above.

During the conscription period nearly 6,000 men were sentenced to prison, placed on probation, or fined, for some violation of the conscription laws. Since less than 50 of these men were Mennonites, and since cases of law violation were relatively few among them, this phase of the story is barely mentioned in a Mennonite history of conscription. Here the story of the nearly 12,000 men in CPS (4,665 of them Mennonites) is of much greater importance. One fourth of the chapters in Sibley and Jacob, however, are devoted to objectors as law violators. The chapter on "Prosecuting the Objector" lists 3,331 cases of prosecution for failure to report for induction; 1,539 for failure to report to a CO camp; 266 for failure to register; 233 for failure to comply with CO assignments; and others. Seventy-five per cent of these cases were Jehovah's Witnesses, whom Selective Service did not consider as conscientious objectors, but which are so regarded by Sibley and Jacob. These received sentences ranging from fines only to imprisonment for more than five years. There is a detailed description of the prosecution process, of prison life and prison treatment. Six

pages are devoted to prison strikes alone. The authors say there was no unanimity of opinion among the pacifists themselves regarding these strikes. Some, "like the War Resisters League, tended to encourage prison strikes and to see in the militancy of strike leaders a pattern to be emulated. Many members of the Historic Peace Churches, however, questioned the necessity and desirability of refusals to work and eat. Indeed, some objectors (most Mennonites, for example) saw the whole strike technique as being essentially immoral in that it supposedly smacked too much of the 'political' methods of 'the world.' It was too much like war" (p. 373). This difference in viewpoint is emphasized again in reporting the withdrawal of the National Service Board for Religious Objectors from the Committee for Amnesty which had been established in December 1945, to work for the release of CO's from prison. The NSBRO "withdrew because several supporting organizations, notably the Mennonites, objected to the use of picketing" (p. 390). One entire chapter is devoted to a detailed account of the experience of certain absolutist objectors: Corbett Bishop, Don DeVault, Stanley Murphy, and Louis Taylor. A chapter of 40 pages is devoted to "The Law of Conscientious Objection."

Nine of the twenty chapters in the book are devoted to CPS, which is viewed as an "experiment in tolerance." One chapter describes the origins of CPS. Another reviews the service record which shows a total of 8,237,000 man days of work performed and which was generally appreciated by the government agencies concerned. The chapter on "The Schooling of Peacemakers" is an excellent treatment of the educational, religious, and social life of the camps, their government and discipline, the problems involved, and an evaluation of the experience. While the Mennonites were not satisfied with the 70 to 80 per cent attendance at their Sunday church services, this record was much better than that in non-Mennonite camps where concentrations of liberals sometimes developed a Bohemian atmosphere of an extreme sort. Even so, despite the frustrations and boredom of camp life, "lapses of moral behaviour were remarkably infrequent . . . and were certainly far less of a problem than in the armed forces" (p. 179). Chapters on "The Restraint of Liberty"; "Government Camps: Prescription for 'troublemakers' "; "The Protests of Conscience"; "Reform and Salvage"; and "The Erosion of Tolerance," are packed with factual material and helpful analysis, much of which describes a type of conscientious objection quite different from that of the Mennonites.

Certainly many of the attitudes and procedures described in this book do not express the New Testament way of life as that way is understood by the nonresistant people. On the other hand, this book is a genuine challenge to the Mennonite reader to examine and evaluate his own position in the light of the total conscientious objector picture. It is true that conformity to the will of God, rather than success in the promotion of civil liberties, must be the criterion with which to judge the validity of any form of pacifism or nonresistance. The New Testament emphasizes the doing of justice to others in preference to the demanding of justice for oneself. It teaches that the Christian must suffer injustice rather than to violate the way of love in order to obtain justice for oneself. This does not mean, however, that the Christian can complacently fold his arms and do nothing in the face of evil and injustice for fear of violating the law of love. The Old Testament prophets rebuked injustice and every form of evil in no uncertain terms. Jesus and the apostles did likewise. The line between Christian love and nonresistance on the one hand, and the waging of the Christian "warfare" on the other, is a fine line, but it is a line which must be found.

The more militant type of pacifist is in danger of straying too far to the left of this line, whereas the nonresistant Mennonite is in danger of straying too far to the right. *Conscription of Conscience* serves a useful purpose in helping the latter to find the line. For example, in Chapter VIII, "The Struggle for Social Justice," the story is told of a Negro professor's request for assignment to the CPS camp at Gatlinburg, Tennessee, and of the rejection of the request by Selective Service, assigning the man to a camp north of the Mason and Dixon line. There were demands from within the Gatlinburg camp that the camp be closed if the assignment was not made as requested, and these demands were supported by a subcommittee of the Friends' CPS Committee. The AFSC did not accept this drastic proposal but the net result of the prolonged discussion was "to close the door to any new projects under Friends' administration which could not be interracial." The MCC, on the other hand, agreed in 1944 to open a new public health unit in Mississippi when it was known that it could not be an interracial camp. When it was severely criticized by men from Quaker camps for doing so, the MCC defended its action "on the grounds that an interracial camp was impossible in the situation, and that by carrying on a program which served both white and Negro families, and quietly demonstrating a belief in the brotherhood of man, more could be accomplished toward a solution of the race problem in the South than by having no project at all" (p. 158).

Can the two causes of social justice and nonresistant love be served best by the course which was followed by the MCC or by that advocated by its critics? This reviewer is biased in favor of the MCC position, but he is also aware that experiences of this kind have helped the Mennonites to be more alert to their responsibility for social justice and have led them to a more careful examination of their own position lest it lead them too far to the right of the line referred to above. The book under review is filled with incidents which bring this issue into sharp focus, compelling the nonresistant Mennonite constantly to rethink and to re-evaluate this aspect of his faith and life.

The difficulty in finding the answer to this question is demonstrated by the fact that in the concluding chapter of *Conscription of Conscienct* the coauthors themselves differ sharply in their evaluation of the CPS program. On the question, "Did the churches betray religious liberty by collaborating with Selective Service in the administration of alternative service?" Mr. Sibley says:

"I believe emphatically that the long-run interests of religious and civil liberty would have been better served had the churches refused to administer alternative service . . . . By continuing to administer conscription they established a principle which might well bolster the arguments of Erastians and militarists in the future. By assuming an enormous financial burden, they not only enabled the state to evade its responsibility for the support of objectors but also depleted their own limited resources which were so desperately needed for relief. By continuing so long to co-operate with a compulsory system of payless work, they served poorly the cause of social justice and helped set a precedent for the exploitation of labor. . . .

"The churches ought to have issued a declaration of independence against the warmaking state. Instead, while gaining incidental benefits for objectors in the process, they allowed themselves to be manipulated by the state for its own ends. It was a tragedy of World War II that, while the churches strove to protect liberty within the narrow limits prescribed by military officers, they did not see that their unique role ought to have been

to stand outside the system and judge it from the perspective of religious absolutes. In so doing they would have served better the cause of conscientious objectors and of liberty in general."

Mr. Jacob's view on the same question is as follows:

"Although the higher ideals of service which were espoused in Civilian Public Service were grievously frustrated, the churches which financed and administered the program won a new and significant place for the religious-pacifist minority in American society. . . . Most of those assigned to CPS deliberately chose to serve under religious administration, even when they had the option of service directly under the government. . . . Under such circumstances, if the churches had decided to withdraw from CPS they would arbitrarily have forced all co's under government administration, closing the channel of service which most preferred as the means of expressing their beliefs.

"The heavy financial responsibilities of religious administration of CPS strengthened the recognition of the right of conscientious objection within the churches. Most Protestant denominations were impelled to go beyond nominal profession of belief in the sanctity of individual conscience and to support their co's materially, even though their members were overwhelmingly committed to the war. As a result, the legitimacy of the position of the co was vindicated 'under fire.' The Historic Peace Churches which bore the major responsibility were not weakened by the call of CPS upon their resources. . . . Their members gave more generously and more completely to support the CPS program than any of their previous church enterprises—*without* detracting from the other aspects of their church work. As a matter of fact, the habit of giving to CPS carried over to the benefit of the relief programs of the churches, which were looked upon as an essential outgrowth of the same spiritual convictions upon which the service of the co's was grounded.

"In the long run, church administration of CPS may have made its most significant contribution to the cause of religious freedom in the United States by exploring the means of assuring independence of religious thought and action from state control, even under conditions of war which appear to dictate the absorption of all of life by the state. The traditional separation of church and state has been distorted by the growth of nationalism to the point where, at least in time of war, the church has joined forces with the state in the prosecution of avowedly common ends. Even in the United States, churches during the last war tended to treat their independence as essentially an *organizational* matter, not one of principle. The Historic Peace Churches sought to reverse this relationship. By accepting organizational and administrative responsibility under government authority, they undertook to defend the separation of religious principle from state control. In this attempt they achieved notable results. They suffered increasing encroachments upon their administrative autonomy, but they vigorously resisted the dictates of the government when clear issues of conscience or religious belief were at stake; Selective Service almost uniformly yielded at these points (for instance, assignment to work of military significance)....

"They paid the price of subservience to government authority in assuming *public* responsibilities, but in return they secured a substantial measure of freedom for *individual* religious thought and expression on the part of the co's whose convictions they upheld. In so doing, they in effect reinterpreted for the days of World War II the persistent Christian enigma of 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's' " (475).

Of these two points of view this reviewer believes that of Mr. Jacob to be the more sound.

Goshen College Guy F. Hershberger

[1] Melvin Gingerich, *Service for Peace: A History of Mennonite Civilian Public Service* (Akron, Pa., 1949); Guy F. Hershberger, *The Mennonite Church in the Second World War* (Scottdale, Pa., 1951).

[2] Leslie Eisan, *Pathways of Peace: A History of the Civilian Public Service Program Administered by the Brethren Service Committee* (Elgin, Ill., 1948).

The Meaning of Love. Edited by Ashley Montagu. New York: The Julian Press, Inc., 1953. Pp. 248.

This symposium is a welcome sequel to Sorokin's "Explorations in Altruistic Love" previously reviewed in these pages. (REVIEW, July 1952.) The scope of the book can best be described by listing the table of contents: The Origin and Meaning of Love, On Loving, Maternal Love, Love in Healthy People, The Power of Creative Love, Sexual Love—Man Toward Woman, Sexual Love—Woman Toward Man, Love of Friends, The Love of Mankind, The Love of God. Each of these chapters is written by an eminent authority and original thinker. In spite of the variety of background of these writers—anthropologist, philosopher, medical practitioners, Jewish social philosopher, and Unitarian theologian are included—there is a remarkable unity in this volume. All testify to the creative power of love. And by love they do not mean a libidinous erotic pleasure principle, but rather a drive toward co-operative creation in the *philia* or *agape* sense. Even the *eros* is interpreted as an urge toward co-operative creative action.

Readers of the REVIEW will be especially interested in the longest and most thought-provoking chapter on "The Power of Creative Love" by Sorokin and Hansen. It is their purpose to "sum up a vast body of evidence in favor of the enormous power of creative love, friendship, and of nonviolence and nonaggressive conduct in human affairs and social life." There is a long series of incidents, which the authors state could be multiplied *ad libitum,* to show that love and kindness stop aggression and enmity. The stories come from widely varied sources, but Quakers, Mennonites, and missionaries figure heavily in the initiation of friendly action. Those whose conduct has been changed include savages, mental patients, college students, Russian Communist soldiers and wolves. Readers of these pages will be interested in the story of a Russian Mennonite community that was frightened, in 1917, into arming for protection as a marauding band of ruffians approached. The results were tragic. They repented and resolved to return to their traditional pacifist position. When the next band came they went out to meet them with prayers instead of guns. The marauders left without inflicting injury and did not return.

Sorokin's study shows that loving increases length of life as evidenced by the greater length of life of the canonized saints in spite of a heavy toll of martyrdom. The authors point out that in all schools of psychotherapy the common ground for curative therapy consists in sympathetic understanding and an "acceptance" of the patient by the therapist. As evidence of the power of love to prevent mental illness they call attention to the record of the Hutterites and Mennonites in what appears to this reviewer an overstatement: "In our age of 'psychoneuroses' and of considerable juvenile delinquency, the Mennonite and the Hutterite communities in the United States show either no or the lowest quota of delinquents, criminals, and

mentally sick persons. The chief reason for this is that these communities try to practice in the interrelationship of their members the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount; they not only preach love but realize it in their daily practice. No member of the communities is deprived of love, and all are united into one real brotherhood."

Sorokin and Hansen next turn to the place of love as applied to social problems and especially war in one of the most effective essays against war as a method of solving problems this reviewer has seen. In contrast the effectiveness of peaceful, friendly policies as applied by governments shows that here, as in personal relations, love begets love and hate breeds hate.

H. M. Kallen's chapter on "The Love of Mankind" deserves special mention. He points out clearly that the brotherhood of man, at least in the Hebrew-Christian tradition, is dependent on the Fatherhood of God. This concept of an all-embracing love has been a unifying force and been the mainspring of missionary endeavor. However, excessive zeal for unity and uniformity has brought strife and division, as witness the results of the Inquisition and other similar zealous movements. Kallen's equation of Protestantism with the philosophies of the Enlightenment is historically only too true. The abandonment of the idea of The City of God for a Cosmopolis, a city of natural man, is certainly a departure from New Testament Christianity. Love of mankind in the Christian (and Mennonite) sense is not to be confused with Humanism or Democracy. Kallen is clear on this and deserves careful study.

The last chapter, "The Love of God," is a liberal study of the principle stated by Kallen when he quotes Brunner, "Love, as the New Testament intends it, is impossible to man; it is possible to God alone." Here a Unitarian theologian argues that to the true atheist nothing is sacred, sovereign, or ultimately reliable. Man thus isolated is a miserable prodigal who needs to return to the fellowship of the Father's house, where love is inclusive (not exclusive like the elder son's). This belief in God and His love must "become the basis for principles of social action and organization." Only when the love of God becomes incarnate will we have a solution to our ills.

The Mennonite reader will be agreeably surprised at the many areas of agreement which these modern liberal scholars have with Mennonite teaching and doctrine. This agreement arrived at by different roads reminds one of Sorokin's teaching that love, and especially love of truth, leads to truth, beauty, goodness, and happiness.

Goshen College H. Clair Amstutz

Krieg, Kriegsdienst und Kriegsdienstverweigerung nach der Botschaft des Neuen Testaments. By Walther Bienert. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1952. Pp. 177, plus bibliography and Scripture reference index.

Since the American decision to remilitarize Western Germany, the question of military service and conscientious objection has received considerable attention in the German religious press. Feeling that most of these treatments lack in Scriptural foundation, Bienert has undertaken to provide a basic study sufficiently detailed to orient the discussion according to the New Testament's understanding of the nature of war and the function of the state. The book is part of the *bekennende Kirche* movement and should have considerable effect on evangelical thought in Germany.

Bienert goes about the task with typical German thoroughness, summing up each paragraph's results in a "Thesis," 38 of which form the structure of the book, beginning with war and the Cross and ending with war and the return of Christ. His knowledge and use of the Biblical texts is on

the whole excellent, and he develops clearly the relation of the Cross to evil, nonresisting suffering love as the Christian way, and the sinfulness of war.

Because of this Biblical treatment it is all the more regrettable that this study, thorough as it is, did not begin with an analysis of the author's own ethical suppositions. Much of the painstaking building of thesis upon thesis is undermined by the assumptions, neither defined nor drawn from the Bible, which dictate the framework of the study.

One of these presuppositions is the "two-realm" theory formulated by Luther, according to which the Christian derives his individual ethics from the Gospel and his social ethics from somewhere else. That this theory might be questioned on Biblical grounds never enters Bienert's mind.

Second is the concept of legitimate defense, assumed without question. On the individual level the use of violence for self-defense is legitimated in one dependent clause; in the case of the state the development is somewhat longer but no less superficial. The New Testament basis for the argument is dependent on misinterpretation, and centers on three mishandled texts. Jesus' seeming approval of the two swords in Gethsemane is interpreted as justifying self-defense for Christians, in spite of the obvious awkwardness of such exegesis, which in addition to supposing that two swords could defend eleven disciples and ignoring Jesus' introductory words, misconstrues entirely the relation of discipleship to the example of Christ and makes of the Cross a purely mechanical expiation with no meaning for ethics. The second text is John 18:36 (If my kingdom were of this world my servants would fight) which, in faithful application of the two-realm theory, is taken to authorize the Christian to fight for the defense of kingdoms which *are* of this world. Still worse hermeneutically is the use made of the parable of the warring king (Luke 14:31 ff.). The kind of explanation here used, if imposed similarly upon other N.T. parables, would mean that Jesus approves of running out of bread and waking up the neighbors at midnight, of furnishing an immature son with funds to waste in riotous living, of losing coins, of cheating one's master, and of coming as a thief.

Third of the untenable assumptions is the naive distinction between initiating a war, which is sin, and punishing the nation which initiated it, which is the state's duty. If the Christian is *absolutely convinced* that in a particular war his state is the aggressor, conscientious objection is his duty; in all other cases disobedience to the state is disobedience to God. This is pure Luther, but obviously not pure N.T., although with Bienert's assumptions the development is logical. Since no private citizen in wartime has the means to know what he would need for absolute certainty, the concrete meaning of the argument is that Christian participation in war is sin and that it runs counter to the state's own goal of protecting the innocent and punishing the guilty.

It is disappointing to see such an amount of painstaking study completely misdirected because of the persistence of non-Biblical attitudes used by Luther to justify his Constantinian compromise; especially so when German Protestant thought would be open to new and more Biblical approaches. For once a social strategy, even one which aims to fulfill the state's God-given function, becomes more normative in ethics than the claims of the Gospel and the church upon the individual, the essential sacrifice of redemption's primary claim upon the Christian has been made. And thus continental theology goes on giving more weight to the status quo than to redemption in the definition of ethical responsibility, and the church continues to show toward the state the docility pledged to Constantine.

Valdoie, France John Howard Yoder

NOTICE

Back Issues of the Review Desired

The following issues of the Mennonite Quarterly Review are either out of print or the supply is almost exhausted. The Review office is therefore offering fifty cents each for any copy in the list below. Send any issue in the list or as many as you have available to Nelson Springer, Circulation Manager, Mennonite Quarterly Review, Goshen, Indiana, who will mail you a check for your shipment.

1927 January	1940 April
April	July
July	October
October	1942 April
1928 January	July
April	October
July	1943 January
1929 April	July
July	October
1930 January	1944 January
April	April
October	July
1931 January	October
April	1945 January
July	April
1932 January	October
October	1946 January
1933 January	April
April	1947 January
July	April
1937 January	1948 January
1939 January	1950 July

THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW

INDEX to Volume XXVII, 1953

JANUARY

Editorial 2
The Zwickau Prophets, Thomas Müntzer, and the Anabaptists 3
Harold S. Bender Goshen College
The First Anabaptist Congregation: Zollikon, 1524 17
Fritz Blanke, University of Zürich
Church Music of the Old Order Amish and Old Colony Mennonites 34
Charles Burkhart, Goshen, Indiana
The Early History of the Mennonites in Welland County, Ontario 55
J. C. Frets, Kitchener, Ontario
Bibliographical and Research Notes
Recent Tirolese Anabaptist Research 76
Paul Peachey, Zürich, Switzerland
A Communication on the Origins of the Early Eighteenth Century Pennsylvania Mennonite Immigrants 78
Martin H. Brackbill, New Cumberland, Pennsylvania
Book Reviews 83
Justus G. Holsinger, *Serving Rural Puerto Rico: A History of Eight Years of Service by the Mennonite Church*
Reviewed by H. Clair Amstutz
David Hinshaw, *Rufus Jones, Master Quaker*
Reviewed by Orie O. Miller
Luella Creighton, *High Bright Buggy Wheels*
Reviewed by John A. Hostetler
Beatrice Jenny, *Das Schleitheimer Täuferbekenntnis 1527*
Reviewed by Paul Peachey
Theologische Zeitschrift (8. Jahrgang Heft 4, July/August 1952)
Reviewed by Harold S. Bender

APRIL

Editorial 90
The Conception of Our Fathers Regarding the Church 91
N. van der Zijpp, Rotterdam, Holland
The Writings of Luther Against the Anabaptists 100
John S. Oyer, Chicago, Illinois
Hutterite Medicine and Physicians in Moravia in the Sixteenth Century and After 111
John L. Sommer, Chicago, Illinois
Hutterite Physicians and Barber-Surgeons (Additional Notes) 128
Robert Friedmann, Kalamazoo, Michigan
Mennonite Preaching 137
Roy Umble, Goshen College
Bibliographical and Research Notes 143
An Annotated Bibliography of Published Mennonite Sermons
H. S. Bender and N. P. Springer
Book Reviews 158
Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer, herausgegeben vom Verein für Reformationsgeschichte. Volume IV *Baden and Pfalz.* Volume V. *Bayern* II.
Reviewed by Robert Friedmann
Helen Clara Fernald, *Plow the Dew Under*
Reviewed by Elmer F. Suderman

JULY

Editorial 162
The Theological Basis for Christian Pacifism 163
Don E. Smucker, Mennonite Biblical Seminary, Chicago, Illinois
Mennonites in Art 187
Harold S. Bender, Goshen College
The Mennonite School Problem in Manitoba 204
E. K. Francis, University of Notre Dame
Bibliographical and Research Notes 237
A Bibliography on the Mennonites of Manitoba
E. K. Francis
Book Reviews 248
Franklin H. Littell, *The Anabaptist View of the Church. An Introduction to Sectarian Protestantism*
Reviewed by Harold S. Bender.
John D. Unruh, *In the Name of Christ. A History of the Mennonite Central Committee and Its Services 1920-1951*
Reviewed by Henry A. Fast
L'Eglise, l' Armee et l'Objection de Conscience. By General H. Guisan, Pierre Bonnard, Andre Bieler, and Rene Girard
Reviewed by John Howard Yoder

OCTOBER

Editorial 258
Spiritualistic Tendencies and Movements Among the Dutch Mennonites of the 16th and 17th Centuries 259
H. W. Meihuizen, The Hague, Netherlands
The Impact of Contemporary Mennonite Evangelistic Outreach on the Larger Society 305
John A. Hostetler, Scottdale, Pa.
Attendance in Mennonite Secondary Schools and Colleges, 1951-52 331
Silas Hertzler, Goshen College
Bibliographical and Research Notes 341
A Guide to Maps in Mennonite Books and Periodicals
Melvin Gingerich
Book Reviews 351
Mulford Q. Sibley and Philip E. Jacob, *Conscription of Conscience: The American State and the Conscientious Objector, 1940-1947*
Reviewed by Guy F. Hershberger
The Meaning of Love. Edited by Ashley Montagu.
Reviewed by H. Clair Amstutz
Walter Bienert, *Krieg, Kriegsdienst und Kriegsdienstverweigerung nach der Botschaft des Neuen Testaments*
Reviewed by John Howard Yoder
Index to Volume XXVII 359